This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES
3 3433 07136848 8

THE

COLONIAL CONTROVERSY,

CONTAINING A

REFUTATION OF THE CALUMNIES

OF THE

ANTICOLONISTS;

THE STATE OF

HAYTI, SIERRA LEONE, INDIA,

CHINA, COCHIN CHINA, JAVA, *&c. &c.*;

THE PRODUCTION OF SUGAR, *&c.*

AND THE STATE OF THE

FREE AND SLAVE LABOURERS IN THOSE COUNTRIES;

FULLY CONSIDERED,

IN A SERIES OF LETTERS,

ADDRESSED TO

The Earl of Liverpool;

WITH A

SUPPLEMENTARY LETTER TO Mr. MACAULAY.

By JAMES MACQUEEN.

Glasgow:

PRINTED BY KHULL, BLACKIE, & CO.

1825.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

TO THE PUBLIC.

THE matter which forms the Letters in the present sheets, was previously published in a similar form in the GLASGOW COURIER of different dates. Some passages which related more particularly to that Paper, and the writer of the Letters, have been omitted, or shortened in the following pages. On the other hand, an additional number of important facts, which bear upon the great question at issue, have been added. The arrangement also is in some parts different, and placed in the order in which it was at the outset intended, had not circumstances arisen, to render it advisable to change that arrangement. The Letter to Mr. MACAULAY has been rendered necessary by some observations and statements which he has made in the republication in a Pamphlet form, of his Letters, first inserted in the New Times. The Letters addressed to Lord Liverpool, are now submitted to the Public, not from any view of private emolument, but solely to render a service to a valuable portion of our Empire, most unjustly, and most wantonly accused, defamed, and endangered.

These sheets may probably find their way to the Colonies, and if they do, they will serve to show the Colonists the nature of the spirit which contends against them in this Country. On their minds I would earnestly impress the fact, that while Reason and Justice will be listened to, and attended to by the British Government, neither have much chance of being listened to amidst the clamours of enthusiasm and speculating philanthropy, out of doors. The fate of the Colonies remains in the hands of the Colonists themselves. Firm, temperate, and judicious proceedings on their part, can alone save them.

JAMES MACQUEEN.

Glasgow, 4th February, 1825.

CONTENTS.

		Page.
Letter	I. Introduction	5
	II. Nottingham Case—Tortola	16
	III. Apprenticed Africans	25
	IV. Steele's Case—Barbadoes	33
	V. Branding Negroes—Jamaica	43
	VI. VII. VIII. Various Misrepresentations Refuted	50
	IX. Hayti—former and present state of, considered	67
	X. XI. XII. Sierra Leone—state of, considered and exposed	85
	XIII. XIV. India, China, Java, &c. free and slave labour, and Sugar produced there, *examined*. Emancipation West India Slaves, &c	133
	XV. XVI. Miscellaneous observations and facts adduced	173
	Appendix—Letter to Zachariah Macaulay, Esq...	195

ERRATA.

Page 36, line 3d, *for* "1790," *read* "1789."
—— 91, line 24th, *for* "an at," *read* "at an."
—— 75, line 18th, (foot Note, *for* "States," *read* "State."

COLONIAL CONTROVERSY.

No. I.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

To the Right Honourable the Earl of Liverpool.

My Lord,

There are moments when the humblest individual in a free country, may, on public questions, be permitted to approach the rulers thereof, and address them in the words of truth. I consider the present period, and the Colonial question now under discussion, and on the issue of which the honour, interest, and prosperity of this country so greatly depend, to be a period and a question of this description.

On this subject, I, in a special manner, address your Lordship, because you are the First Minister of the realm, whose duty it is to watch over and to guard the lives and property of every individual dwelling within the bounds of the British Empire, from danger, violation and harm. I address your Lordship on this occasion, because with your able colleagues, Pitt and Melville, you formerly stemmed, combated, and crushed the gigantic efforts of frenzied revolution, whether amidst terror and blood, these exerted their energies amongst the adorers of the *Goddess of Reason* in the Old World, or under the mask of the *Natural* rights of man, laboured to produce similar results amongst the semi-savage blacks in the New. To you, again, my Lord, the British Empire at this moment looks for justice and protection—to you this nation looks for the preservation of her Colonies, her national faith and her national character, from the violent efforts of a spirit as wild and ungovernable as the former, but not so easily detected, from its being clothed with a more specious, ensnaring and deceitful veil.

An able article in the last number of the QUARTERLY REVIEW, and which, when compared with official despatches and communications, evidently speaks the sentiments of His Majesty's Government on this important subject—this article has drawn forth all the anti-colonial ire, and anti-colonial "venom." In the anxiety of their champion to make out their misrepresentations and unfounded assertions, and to support and make good their case of injustice and oppression, the paper in which I write, and the person who has at present the honour to address your Lordship, come in, amongst others, for a large and particular share of their reproach, reprobation, and condemnation; as these are to be found in a series of letters bearing the signature of their great champion, "*Anglus*," and conveyed to the public through the columns of the NEW TIMES of different dates, which it would appear, from a *Government*, has descended to become the anti-colonial Gazette, and, as such, to oppose and traduce the BRITISH GOVERNMENT—*the Government* of our West India Colonies.

Although it is with the matter, not with the individual that is my object, and which I have at present to do, still, it must be admitted, that it is of material importance to know who *Anglus* is, as his lucubrations would doubtless be looked up to with greater attention and consideration, were these believed to proceed from the pen of an official servant, and independent British Legislator, than if they were ascertained to proceed, as I believe they do proceed, from the pen of an irresponsible, interested East India Proprietor, and Sierra Leone "Sophist." I have been compelled to make this research and developement by the mode and manner which *Anglus* has chosen to make his attack. His calculation is *cunning*. The motives and object are appreciated. But *Anglus* has not calculated the result.

"*Common fame*," my Lord, the usual anti-colonial *referee*, sets down *Anglus* as Mr. J. Stephen, but information from good authority, leads me to believe that *Anglus* is no other personage, than *Mr. Zachariah Macaulay*—the individual who, as your Lordship may probably recollect, boasted in his "SECRET" letter to Governor Ludlam, and in name of the African Institution, that, with the exception of one clearheaded Secretary, he

could do what he pleased with the whole British Administration —the individual, I repeat, who arrogated to himself the power and the privilege to "save" the administration of which your Lordship was the head—"to save His Majesty's Ministers THE TROUBLE OF THINKING."* This great personage is, I am told, *Anglus*, though *I believe*, there are more heads than his employed in the composition of the letters which bear that signature.

Be that as it may, however, I scorn, as *Anglus* does, to skulk under a borrowed name. Engaged, as I believe and feel convinced I am engaged, in the cause of truth and justice, I shall save any opponent the trouble of queries and answers, by subscribing my name to this and any future letters I may write on this subject, and, at the same time, I at once identify myself with all the articles in the *Glasgow Courier* since the commencement of the present discussion. They are mine, my Lord,—mine, prompted by no one, influenced by no one, and guided by no one; and what is more, my Lord, unbiassed by interest. I have not a shilling at stake in the West Indies, nor am I directly or indirectly concerned in any business with that quarter of our empire, and the best refutation I can give to the in-

* Letter from Z. Macaulay, Esq. to Thomas Ludlam, Esq. *dated London, November* 4, 1807, and endorsed SECRET.

My dear Sir,—A WORD in private respecting the African Institution. I cannot help regarding it as an *important engine*. We have many zealous friends in it, high in rank and influence, who, I am persuaded, are anxious to do what can be done both for the colony and for Africa. Mr. Perceval and Mr. Canning are with us decidedly. Lord Castlereagh, with whom our business more immediately lies, is good-humoured and complying; but his secretary, Mr. Cooke, is, I fear, hostile to the whole thing, and may be disposed to seize any circumstance which will put it in his power to do us mischief. You will see how very important it is to be aware of this in your communications with Government. Indeed, in all the *ostensible* letters you write, whether to Lord Castlereagh, the African Institution, or myself, it will be right to consider the *effect* of what you say on lukewarm friends, and in the hands of secret enemies, for such will unavoidably mix with us.

* * * * * * * *

I have NO DOUBT that Government will be disposed to adopt almost any plan which we may propose to them, with respect to Africa, *provided we will but save them the trouble of thinking*. THIS you will see to be HIGHLY IMPORTANT.—*(Macaulay's Letter to the Duke of Gloucester, Appendix, p.* 21.*)*

sinuation thrown out, that my motives are "*venal*," is the assertion of *Anglus* himself, that the cause I defend, is opposed to the feelings and the will of every part of our Empire, the West Indies excepted. No Sierra Leone sophist would embark in a contest against such odds. He consults his *interest* more, and he *knows* his interest better.

Anglus, my Lord, while boasting that he is the voice of this nation, and labouring in the "work of God," has chosen to conceal himself under the thin veil of a borrowed name. To use the words of the Edinburgh Review, (Mr. Stephen or Mr. Brougham) vol. 5th, p. 240, &c. "How is this to be accounted for? Very easily. In the case of an *anonymous* writer, we have not that sort of security against misstatements, which we enjoy when any one pleads a cause in *propria persona*. An anonymous writer does not always consider himself as answerable for the accuracy of his allegations and facts; nor have the" *colonists* "now, for the first time, to complain that, against them, instruments and acts of warfare have been used, which the *very same men* who resort to them, *would not have openly employed*. *No cause*, however, can on the long-run prosper, which requires the aid of such auxiliaries AS THESE."

From the view of the matter before me, I fear that in following out the subject, I may be compelled to trespass upon your Lordship's time longer than I could wish, but in a question of such vital importance, involving so many great interests and facts; involving the loss or preservation of a *fourth part* of the trade of Great Britain—of so many millions of property, and the security, the peace, the happiness, and independence of so many millions of the subjects of this Empire, your Lordship will readily perceive and admit that a review of the question cannot be brought into a very narrow compass. The Anticolonists, trusting to the sanctity of their professions, have a happy knack of making a bold and a false statement in a line, which requires pages of official documents to refute. Hence their brevity gives them an advantage in controversy. Trusting, however, to your Lordship's indulgence, I hope, as I proceed, to be able to shew, from documents, which cannot be contradicted nor controverted, whether the Glasgow Courier or *Anglus*

is the safer guide to follow, or rather which is the "UNSAFE GUIDE to follow" on this momentous question.

The question under discussion is a question dependant upon facts. It is a question of civil rights and of civil justice, political economy, political prudence and political power. On these grounds it must be considered and determined. From these grounds however it is in every instance attempted to be withdrawn by all our Anticolonists. With the question resting on these bases they feel the ground they take sliding from below their feet, and hence they endeavour to confuse the question, by *vain* declamation: by substituting clamour, and every kind of misrepresentation and misstatement, in order to withdraw the public mind from the real point at issue, that under deception they may carry their point.

In the *New Times*, September 23d, *Anglus*, with all the supercilious importance peculiar to any thing schooled in and for Sierra Leone, asks in reference to a certain work, "And who is this *Mr. Macqueen*, upon whose testimony the Reviewer —the *demi-official organ*, thus relies without doubt or question —he is the Editor of the *Glasgow Courier*, &c." In reply, my Lord, to this contemptuous query, and in order to place myself on equal ground with my opponent, I am compelled to show, that *Anglus* is MR. MACAULAY, and to observe, that if by chance *Anglus* for a moment stumbles on any thing like truth, he never tells the whole of it. He has omitted to state that "*this Mr. Macqueen*" is besides a British subject—a British subject who finds that of the thousands of pounds which he in one way and another pays in taxes annually to the revenue of this country, almost EIGHT MILLIONS sterling, as I shall show your Lordship before I proceed far in this correspondence, have been spent in, upon, and for Sierra Leone, during the last sixteen years, and a very considerable portion of which, I am told, and I believe, has, in commissions, contracts, exchanges, &c. &c. found its way, regularly and fairly I admit, into the pockets of individuals in this country from their intimate connexion—"*the ties of blood and interest*," with that worthless place. As a *Proprietor* of the *Glasgow Courier*, and as a *British subject*, therefore, my Lord, I stand forward, and have a

right to stand forward, to make some inquiry about my money, at those who have arrogated to themselves the management of Sierra Leone, to ask to what purpose it has been applied—what good it has done; and before I conclude, I hope to be able to shew your Lordship, and my country, that there is not only a necessity for such an inquiry, but an absolute necessity that Sierra Leone should be left to be supported by those whose bantling, and whose gain it is, and whose idle schemes of African Colonization *by* FREE LABOUR, and African civilization, have been so signally defeated. If *Anglus* passes over these important points, that is no reason why I should.

As *Anglus*, has coupled my publication on Colonial subjects with my labours in the *Glasgow Courier*, I may here be permitted to remark, that the *Glasgow Courier* existed before Sierra Leone existed, and will, I hope, and I believe, continue, unchanged in its principles, to exist, when that place is abandoned to the beasts of prey, from the dominion of which it should never have been wrested, if it can yet be said to be wrested from them by this country. The *Glasgow Courier*, my Lord, amidst all the horrors of Liberty and Equality—amidst the terrors and sweep of Napoleonic tyranny, stood, undismayed, by the altar and the throne—the Constitution, in Church and in State—cheered the banners of united Europe, while these marched to independence, to glory, and to victory—opposed with the voice of truth the mania of Radicalism; and having done this, the *Glasgow Courier*, unsolicited and unaided, and unshackled, and *unpaid*, now stands forward, and will stand forward, to defend the cause and the character of the deeply injured population of a most valuable portion of our Empire, from the rude assaults and machinations of a band of political speculators and interested enthusiasts, as dangerous as ever embarrassed the proceedings of any government, or tortured any enlightened nation. Thus employed, my Lord, the conductors of the *Glasgow Courier* flatter themselves, that they may raise their heads in society with equal claims to protection and respect, as any Sierra Leone Sophist, or any individual in London, however high their rank, or their profession, or their character.

It having been deemed "expedient" by *Anglus* "to say a few words with respect to the CREDIBILITY of the Reviewer's witness," it surely cannot be deemed inexpedient, on my part, to adduce a few references, to put "*the credibility*" of the great anticolonial champion, *Anglus*, to the test. In the *New Times* of April 15th, he charges me as advocating slavery in the abstract; he says, "a writer of the name of *Macqueen*, in a thick octavo volume, which he has published IN FAVOUR of Slavery" —and again, in the *New Times* of Sept. 28th, he accuses me of having, in that Work, written an "elaborate VINDICATION of the Slave Trade." *Anglus*, it would appear, had read the book, and could not be misled by false information. There is therefore no necessity for circumlocution or delicacy in this case. The charge here made, and slander here intended to be conveyed, are, in each, *direct and positive falsehoods*. I brand them as such before my country and the world, and "I challenge HIM and the WHOLE BODY of his friends and admirers," to produce one connected passage, fairly quoted, to prove or bear out what he asserts.

The object of that Work, my Lord, had nothing to do with slavery as an abstract question, nor was this question—its justice or injustice, policy or impolicy—once entered into in any shape. The object kept in view was very different. One writer, Mr. Clarkson, stepped forward, and wrote (*Thoughts*, p. 9—11,) that the West India Colonists "had NO TITLE to their Slaves, on the ground of original grants or permissions of Government, or of ACTS OF PARLIAMENT, or of Charters, or of ENGLISH LAW. There is not an individual who holds any of the Slaves by a LEGAL title. I contend," said he, "that there can be, according to the GOSPEL DISPENSATION, no such a state as *West India* Slavery." In opposition to this, my Lord, I produced the official proceedings of the British Government and the *Acts of Parliament*, constituting these Slaves property, and the authority of the Apostles in the New Testament, who certainly understood the Gospel dispensation BETTER than Mr. Clarkson, to show, that slaves existed under the Gospel dispensation, and were commanded by the Apostles (and *Anglus* may shew, if he can, where *they* commanded any thing contrary to

the spirit of the Gospel dispensation) to be obedient to them and the laws of the country. A second writer, the scribe of the LONDON MITIGATION SOCIETY, proclaimed in their general manifesto, that a state of Slavery in human Society, was "criminal, at *direct variance* with the will of the *Supreme Author of the Universe.*" In answer to this, my Lord, and similar doctrines, I adduced, the *positive* laws enacted under the authority of THE UNCHANGEABLE BEING, permitting and regulating such a state of society amongst his chosen people—a proof that it was not at "*direct variance with His will.*" Lastly, Mr. Clarkson and Mr. Buxton, and after them a host of shallow politicians, their "friends and admirers," proclaimed that all the Slaves in our Colonies "*were procured by the most atrocious fraud and violence*—STOLEN." In reply to this, my Lord, I adduced from official documents, published by His Majesty's Government, and from other authorities of unquestionable veracity, the true way in which Slaves were procured in Africa, thus falsifying the daring assertions of the individuals in question, and of those who made similar averments. These, my Lord, with a refutation from official documents of their arguments and averments about East India Sugar, the superior productiveness and cheapness of free labour in Sierra Leone, St. Domingo, &c. over the Slave labour in our own and other Colonies, together with a refutation from official references and personal knowledge of the scandalous falsehoods propagated in this country, regarding the treatment of the Slaves and the state of society in our Colonies—these things, I say, formed the subjects treated of in my work. I challenge *Anglus* to deny what I now state.

But if *Anglus* means to state, that because I deprecate the abrogation of the British Constitution, where it is established in the West Indies—reprobate the contempt with which he speaks of men his equals in rights, his equals in fortune, his equals in intelligence, his equals in integrity, and the unmeasured abuse which he at all times heaps upon them—if, because I state that *his* schemes are wrong, and will, if carried generally into effect, produce ruin, as the bare mention of them has produced revolt—if he means to say that I favour slavery,

because I deprecate the anarchy which would ensue from emancipation, as he recommends it, and because I have exposed the hideous system of lies circulated against our Colonial population—why let him; I am content to bear the reproach. The Right Hon. Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs * stands nearly in the same situation; and if *Anglus dared*, he would, I am convinced, load him with the same reproach that he attempts to fix upon me.

The honesty of the intentions may reasonably be doubted, the soundness of the judgment justly questioned, which mix up the question of slavery in the abstract, with the facts of the treatment of the Slaves in our Colonies, where slavery is by law established. Yet this is constantly done. This system, my Lord, I reprobated. In doing so, I was necessarily compelled to bring forward by name the works and the authors of the works who followed this disgraceful and dangerous course; but beyond this, my Lord, I did no more than what your Noble Colleague, the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies did, in his able and Statesmanlike speech, on the 16th March last, when he fixed the *brand* of general reprobation upon the whole of these inflammatory anticolonial publications, more especially on that one published by Mr. Clarkson, and on the work entitled "Negro Slavery, &c." written by my present assailant, *Anglus*. With equal justice, therefore, might his Lordship be accused of supporting slavery in the abstract, because he did this, as I have been accused of supporting it for having done the same thing. His Lordship said:—

"It would not be doing justice to the subject were their Lordships not reminded of the language held in the other House respecting the comparative case of slaves resident in England and in America; where it was stated, that our treat-

* If I am asked, whether I am for the permanent existence of slavery in our Colonies, I say, No. But if I am asked whether I am favourable to its immediate abolition, I say, No. And if I am asked which I would prefer, permanent slavery, or immediate abolition, I do not know whether under all the perplexing circumstances of the case, I must not say, I would prefer things remaining as they are:—God knows! not from any love of the existing state of things, but on account of the tremendous responsibility of attempting to mend it by a sudden change. Speech 16th March, 1824.

ment of the slaves was nothing in comparison with that of the United States. It remained for him now to advert to what had passed in Jamaica. He much regretted that Jamaica, which had heretofore manifested a sincere desire to ameliorate the condition of the slave population, should now set so opposite an example. He was, however, persuaded, that when the Assembly of that island should come again to the consideration of this subject, they would view it in a more temperate manner; and that they would not persist in the resolutions they had adopted, but would proceed to make farther provision for ameliorating the condition of the slaves. He did not, however, think he should act justly, if he did not state that much irritation had been produced by the *reproaches* cast on the Assembly and *people* of Jamaica. Some apology was to be made for them in consequence of the manner in which they had been *attacked by various publications in this country*. They were accused of the greatest cruelty: of a disposition to retain their negroes in a state of misery, and a determination to resist all plans of amelioration. In addition to these *unjust charges* they were accused of treating their slaves worse than the Americans did theirs. Nothing could be more unfounded than this last accusation; for nothing could redound more to the credit of our West India planters, than a comparison of the treatment given to their slaves with that to which those of America were subject. The American slaves were liable to the severest punishments for acts which would either be considered as no offence in our Colonies, or would be corrected by very slight penalties. It had, indeed, been said by some, that though the laws of the Colonies were good, they were not fairly executed. *This he also must regard as untrue.* He believed the laws were in general fairly executed; and he was certain, that within a certain number of years, a great improvement has taken place in the condition of slaves in the West India Colonies, as well in consequence of the *humane disposition* of the planters, as of the *laws* which had been enacted." &c.

Nothing but ignorance the most obstinate and the blindest prejudice, could mistake the object and meaning of the work to which *Anglus* refers. The malevolent censures of himself, "his friends and his admirers," were not unforeseen, as the following extract from page 149 of my work, declaring very explicitly what I had in view, will show:—

"With the usual *liberality* of the Colonial adversaries, who are compelled to have recourse to declamatory accusation for want of facts, I shall, no doubt, because I have adduced all those facts, be set down as the advocate of slavery and the slave trade. MY OBJECT AND VIEWS ARE VERY DIFFERENT. I have stated these facts, and referred to them, and have been called upon to state and refer to them, in order to refute and repel the foul but unfounded charge and calumnious assertion, that the slaves in our colonies were 'STOLEN—' *obtained by the most atrocious fraud and violence.*' And having done this, I have shewn that the masters of them, on every principle of law and justice, have a legal claim and right to them, and that when the nation changes her laws and takes them away, she cannot do so without giving FULL and complete compensation."

These, my Lord, were my objects and sentiments, I blush not to avow them. I have never ceased to maintain and to state, that, IF the Slaves in our Colonies have been "*stolen*—obtained by the most atrocious fraud and violence"—*if* a state of slavery or to hold Slaves as property, is, individually and nationally, as has been asserted, "at direct variance with the will of the Supreme Author of the Universe," then, that the whole of them ought to be emancipated in a moment, and remunerated for the injury they have sustained at the expense of this country, which, under her laws, brought them into their present state; and not only so, but, at the national expense, restored to the country from which they were "stolen," not sent to that new abode of the most helpless kind of slavery—SIERRA LEONE; but then to convince me of the truth of the first assumption, I, for one, require, and must continue to require, the authority of the Bible, and of the justice and necessity of the latter, authority much higher and wiser than the authority of (and I mean no personal disrespect) Mr. Buxton, or of Mr. Clarkson, or even of Mr. Z. Macaulay.

The individual, my Lord, who could so unblushingly and deliberately falsify the sentiments and facts contained in the work alluded to, and which I have here shortly endeavoured to state to your Lordship, merely for the purpose of raising "prejudice" and clamour amongst the uninformed, the unthinking and the unwary, against the writer whose facts he could not refute, will not stick at trifles. As I proceed, I will shew this fact in strong colours, and at the same time point out the intolerable arrogance, and utter "*contempt for all authority*," on every occasion evinced by *Anglus*, "*et hoc genus omne*." The case of the Nottingham and other emancipated Slaves in Tortola, and the apprenticed African Negroes there and in other Colonies, enable me to do this in a striking manner, and as *Anglus* has chosen these as one of his chief points of attack, I shall accordingly take him up by placing the case of the former in the front of the battle.

I am, &c.

JAMES MACQUEEN.

Glasgow, 6th October, 1824.

COLONIAL CONTROVERSY.

No. II.

NOTTINGHAMS, &C.—TORTOLA.

To the Right Honourable the Earl of Liverpool.

My Lord,

"Reasoning people in this country" are not to be deceived by professions, or lulled by pretensions. The arbitrary and tyrannical disposition of the anticolonists are witnessed and made manifest on every occasion. No one must question their authority. All authority which militates against their views, their plans, and their theories, must be rejected. Experience, facts and local knowledge are all trodden under foot by distant theorists—by enthusiasm and interested speculation. Even official documents furnished by His Majesty's Government—from responsible agents, are passed by with contempt and rejected with scorn, when these differ, as they almost invariably do differ from the reports or *dreams* of anticolonial spies and irresponsible agents.

Anglus, in his wrath and anger, having stumbled upon the Nottingham Case, Tortola, I proceed to bring its merits more particularly before your Lordship, and in doing so, will adduce another proof of "*the credibility*" of this anticolonial Champion as a witness. I shall not, however, waste your Lordship's time nor exhaust your Lordship's patience by wading through the miserable quibbles by which, in the *New Times*, Letter, No. 5, *Anglus* attempts to evade the real merits of the question or invalidate the testimony of my authorities (from *one* of which for obvious reasons he shrinks) on minor points. Instead of doing this, I take up at once the original anticolonial statements regarding these people, and meet these with statements and facts, authenticated with names and with

official references. The case of the Nottinghams must, I presume, be familiar to your Lordship, as it was last year thrust forward not only into every periodical publication and into every hand, but I believe placed before His Majesty's Government, (in order to promote and to increase our national and Colonial prosperity) as affording safe and correct data upon which the members thereof should proceed to enfranchise all the Slaves in our Colonies. I give it entire that I may not be accused of mutilation. The statement runs thus:—

In the year 1776, Samuel Nottingham, a Quaker, who became possessed of a small estate in Tortola, to which were attached 25 Negroes—viz. six men, ten women, four boys, and five girls—determined on manumitting them. He accordingly did manumit them.

In the year 1822 this little colony of free persons was visited several times by two highly respectable gentlemen; on whose authority we are enabled to state the following particulars. "Of the original persons liberated, nine are still alive; besides whom, there are twenty-five of their children, and nine grandchildren, making in all forty-three persons. The whole of them reside on the same plantation, which they have ever since cultivated. Half of it is chiefly in provisions, and the rest is used as pasturage for their stock, which consists of twenty-eight cows, thirteen goats, and thirteen hogs. Formerly they cultivated cotton, but, the price falling very low, they did not continue to plant it. Jeffry Nottingham, one of those originally emancipated, exclusive of his share in the plantation and stock, possesses five acres of land and a house in Spanishtown, and a vessel of 23 feet keel. Diana and Eve (born since 1776) have each a boat of 17 and 14 feet keel. For five years the seasons were so bad that they found it difficult to get water for their stock, and got little return for their labour: but still they had been able to support themselves, and to acquire the property mentioned above, while they increased in number from 25 to 43. Not one of them is now in debt; and their property is free from all incumberance. Twelve of the grown-up persons are members of the Methodist Society, and, with their children, attend regularly the Methodist Chapel at East-End, except in case of sickness. During the whole period since their emancipation none of them have been sued in court, or brought before a magistrate to answer to any complaint. Only one of them once obtained a warrant against a person who had assaulted him, who begged his pardon and was forgiven. The same person, on coming from sea, was arrested the day he landed for a capitation tax on free persons, of which he had not been apprized, and put into prison. The next day he paid the money, about 18 dollars, and was released. Several of them can read and write. Jeffry's wife, Grace, acts as schoolmistress: she reads well. They have lately built three houses in their village, of wood, and shingled. The whole of their houses, had been destroyed by the hurricane of 1819, and have since been rebuilt. They are a fine healthy race, *all black*, having intermarried with each other; and seem to dwell very happily together.—*(Substance Debate on Buxton's motion, p. 234, 236, and 237.)*

Having made this statement the anticolonial scribe who, I believe, is *Anglus*, proceeds to state that "they have ACCUMULATED some property, and as far as advantage to this country goes, we will venture to say, the forty-three Nottinghams CONSUME more of British produce and manufactures in a year, and PROMOTE THE TRAFFIC OF TORTOLA itself more than THREE TIMES the number of slaves would do."

Assertions are easily made, my Lord, but not so easily substantiated. The names of the "*two* respectable Gentlemen" upon whose "authority" the above statement is said to be made, are not given. I will *venture* to supply them. They are, my Lord, (I can be corrected if I am wrong) Major THOMAS MOODY and JOHN DOUGAN, Esq. the two Commissioners sent out by His Majesty's Government to examine into the state of the apprenticed Africans in Tortola and other places. So far from these two gentlemen having made or authorized such a statement, I assert, and on the authority of the first named meritorious officer and intelligent Gentleman, that the state of these people is the reverse of the preceding picture. So far from "intermarrying with each other," the fact, I learn from various persons, is directly the reverse; and as for one of them having been "*arrested for a capitation tax*," that cannot be true, because there is NO capitation tax on free people in Tortola. So far from these people having "ACCUMULATED PROPERTY"—that is, grown richer, they grow poorer daily, and have nearly lost their all; so far from adding to the "TRAFFIC OF TORTOLA," or "the consumption of the British manufactures," to an extent "*three times greater*" than the same number of slaves, I assert upon the authority just adduced, and other authority equally accurate and respectable, that they add nothing whatever to the "traffic of Tortola," consume scarcely any British manufactures, and in proportion far less than slaves do. They do not raise a single taxable article, either to add to the revenue of the Colony, or to the revenue of the Mother Country. The very fact admitted by the anticolonial scribe, that from the "LOW PRICE OF COTTON," they had been forced to abandon the cultivation of it, though they had received lands in cultivation, and works, (Cotton works I mean) and capital to enable them to carry it

on, and with the market of Great Britain open to them—this important fact I say speaks volumes, and overthrows with a breath the whole system for which *Anglus* and his friends are contending, because, either the produce raised by these free people, has been *beat out* of the European market, by cotton produced at a *lower price by slaves*, or else those emancipated Negroes refuse to labour even at light cotton cultivation. This conclusion is irresistible. But I believe both reasons have operated to produce the result. I repeat the statement made in my work, and which has drawn forth the indignation of *Anglus*, that these people are considered a nuisance to their neighbours, and to the community, and that so far from living in a state of comfort and independence, they are really in a state of poverty and distress, and in several instances supported by slaves. In proof of what I state, and what I have stated regarding these people, I lay before your Lordship the following very particular and accurate statement, drawn up at my special request, by DANIEL FRAZER, Esq. of Tortola, and who authorizes me to use his name.

Particulars respecting the Negroes and their progeny manumitted by Mr. Nottingham, Mr. Percival and Mr. Harragin.

Mr. Samuel Nottingham, in or about the year 1776, gave twenty-five Negroes their freedom with fifty-five acres of land, in Fat-hog Bay, named Long Look, in the East-end Division of the Island of Tortola. Mr. Nottingham's sister, Mrs. Hannah Abbot, left those people a legacy of 166 joes or £316: 16s. sterling, which was paid to them by the late Dr. Dawson of this Island.

These people and their progeny, with the above advantages were accounted for in April 1823, by Dr. John Stobo; and corrected up to March 1824, by Daniel Fraser, as follows:—N. 1, Haggar—2. Jung—3. Mimbo—4. Dorah—5. Amaritta—6. Betsy—7. Sarah; these seven women died without issue—8. Molly, elderly and scarcely able to support herself—9. Margaret, infirm and incapable of work, mother of three daughters, viz. Dorah, Eve and Deborah—10. Dorah, mother of ten children. viz.—

Samuel, by Cudjoe, a slave of Bez. Hodge, Esq. deceased.
Elizabeth, by Damon, a do. do. do.

Eliza,
William,
George,
Daniel,
Mimbo,
Tillah,
Linda, dead,
Peter,

By Jack Potter, a free man, who is now blind.

Elizabeth has two children.

Sally, by Adam Cruse, now a slave of M. Lettsome's.

Adam, by Allen, a free man in Spanish Town.

No. 11, Eve, mother of eight children.

Mary,
Jane,
Jacob,
Isaac,
Abraham,
William,
Martha,
James,

By Jasper Rapsott, a free man, who is a fisherman and shipwright; he, with Eve, Jane, Jacob and Isaac, partially cultivate about 5 acres of land, in provisions, and possess a few cattle, goats and pigs.

Mary has a boy, named John Abram, by Abram Vanterpool, a free man to whom she is married.

12. Diana—Mother of seven children, viz.:—

Meshey,
Margaret,
Joseph,
Jeffry,
John Francis,
Diana,

By Jeffry, a slave of Mr. Pickering's, who works Diana's ground, and occasionally hires other slaves of Mr. Pickering's to assist.

13. Belinda—infirm and not able to work; mother of five children;

William, dead.
Beneba,
John,
Jeffry,
Tamsen,

Fathers unknown.

Beneba had a son named George, by Pero, a slave of Mr. Challwell, who left this Colony some years since. She lived the most of her time, since she grew up (successively) with two white men, both of whom are dead, and she is now in the Danish island of St. Thomas.

John has a daughter, named Beneba, by Fanny Sharpe, a free woman—Jeffry, has three children, viz.:—

Rebecca,
Elizabeth,
Blucher,

By Grace Frett, a free woman, to whom he is married; himself and Mary are the only married persons among the Nottinghams.

Jeffry is a (botch of a) carpenter, he owns a shallop-boat, in which he draws fish-pots, and occasionally goes to St. Thomas in her, with stock and firewood; the former of which is most frequently stolen, and the latter cut by run-away slaves, in the surrounding woods. The heirs of the late Hon. Abram C. Hill had a flock of sheep, with some horned cattle, on a dismantled estate of theirs, almost adjoining the Nottinghams, which amounted to upwards of 300; but not long since, when they came to overhaul them, they could not find more than about 50, and a good many horned cattle were likewise stolen. He had his shallop hauled up to repair some time ago, and were it not for the assistance of the neighbours, he never would have been able to complete her. He still owes for

500 feet of boards for that purpose. The Hon. Joseph Harragin gave him the present suit of sails for the shallop. Commissions given to Jeffry to perform in St. Thomas were frequently omitted by him, and the money for the purpose appropriated to his own purposes. Persons of credibility to whom he served such tricks informed me of this: many others, for whom he purchased articles, had them either mutilated or robbed some way or other. Jeffry cultivates about an acre of land in provisions.

Tamsen has no children living. She lived for the last 14 years on the north-side estate of the late Mrs. Ruth Lettsome, with a slave named Gift, and whatever support she receives is from said slave. A few days since Dr. Stobo, the medical Gentleman attending said estate, gave her advice and medicine gratis, and she partly receives nourishment from said estate's stores.

No. 14. Benero,	Dead.	No. 20. Primus,	Dead.
15. Hannah,		21. George,	
16. Oronoko,		22. Peter,	
17. Rowley,		23. Little Rowley,	
18. Harry,		24. Will,	
19. Simon,		25. Adam,	

The *three* women, Molly, Margaret, and Belinda, are the only survivors of the 25 originally manumitted by Mr. Nottingham. They and their descendants and families, notwithstanding what pilferage they may be guilty of, find it very difficult to support themselves. Their grounds in seasonable years are capable of giving a good return if properly cultivated, but at present there is not a piece of ground in this island, cultivated by slaves, that has such a barren appearance. The houses in the place are ten in number, two of them shingled, the largest of which is owned by Jeffry Pickering (a slave) and the other by Jasper Rapsott (a freeman) the largest is about 11 feet by 8, and the smallest about 10 by 8; the rest of the huts are infinitely inferior to the general run of huts owned and occupied by slaves on estates in this island. Besides Jeffry's boat, two others of the Nottinghams have the name of owning two open cobles which are generally used for fishing. Jeffry Pickering is the most ostensible person in the place.

Estimated value of the property possessed by them.

	Sterling.
50 Acres of Land, ...	£68 8 0
23 head of cattle old and young, at £4 6s. ...	92 0 0
7 goats and 10 hogs, at 10s.	8 10 0
8 huts, at £3 each, ...	24 0 0
2 fishing cobles, ...	10 0 0
Shallop, ...	10 0 0
Furniture, clothing, &c. at 15s. each, ...	29 15 0
	£242 13 0

So that after so many years freedom, they are poorer than the sum left them in money, and which they received, besides the value of their land.

THEIR GENERAL CHARACTER.

The males are (and always have been) much given to idleness, and many of them to inebriety; they do not (nor ever did) cultivate their grounds so well as the generality of the slaves in this island. Several of those dead, died in great poverty and want. They were always very troublesome and disagreeable to their neighbours. There is a warrant out, at the present time, against one of them named John, for an assault and battery. One of the females can read, and Jeffry can read, and attempts to write, and Grace Frett his wife, who is a free woman from Spanish Town, can read, and used to have three or four children under her, teaching them very little more than the alphabet. The imputed property of five acres of land, and a house in Spanish Town, as belonging to Jeffry, proves, on inquiry, to be only a small patch, something less than *one acre*, and a thatched hut which Grace got from her father.

[Mr. Frazer next proceeds to give me a similar account of several slaves emancipated by Mr. Percival and Mrs. Harragin, from which account I content myself with selecting the following general paragraphs from the Glasgow Courier, October 9th, 1824.]

THE PERCIVAL NEGROES.

Mr. Percival, on the 15th of March, 1811, manumitted 17 slaves, who were nearly equal in number, with respect to sexes. He gave them about one hundred and seventy acres of land in Guana Island, with crop, stock and houses, as he then possessed, and which were previously rented by Mr. Lettsome for a considerable sum of money.

More than half of them sold their land to Mr. Harragin, as also their stock, which they spent, in a very short time, in revelling and dissipation. The females are chiefly dependant on slaves for their support: seldom cohabiting for any length of time with one individual. They cultivate no land (except Bristol), have no stock, and only possess two huts.

THE HARRAGIN NEGROES.

Miraim Harragin, formerly Vanterpool, widow of Jonathan Harragin, late of the east end of Tortola, died on the 31st of January 1816, and manumitted Twenty negroes, and gave them 40 acres of land in the Island of Great Camanoes, one of the Virgin Islands.

Nancy has one child since her freedom, named Eleanor, by a slave of Mr. Lettsome, named London, who is also the reputed father of other children. Some short time ago, Nancy was married to London by one of the Methodist Missionaries, who threatened him, if he did not marry, to turn him out of their Society. He complied—but so little respect did he pay to the religious rites, that so soon as he got rid of the Parson and ceremony, he went across the small ferry from the East End Chapel to Beef Island, where he spent the night with another woman slave of his master (Mr. Lettsome) named Chloe, that he kept before that and since. This I have heard from Chloe's own mouth, in the presence of several white persons. Nancy does not cultivate any ground, but subsists by knitting fishing nets and other means not visible. She is about 40 years of age, but well able to work, and has only one child to support.

Prince was said to be the most industrious of all Mrs. Harragin's people, but some time since he deserted his wife, by whom he had three children, who are since dependant on her for support. He died a few years since of a venereal disease, which came to such a height, though he concealed it, that he was completely eat away. The ants took possession of him as soon as dead. Charles Lloyd, Esq. furnished a board to make him a coffin, and Mr. William Skerret furnished the other articles for his interment, without the least prospect of payment, he having left nothing.

The 40 acres of land left by Mrs. Harragin were not in cultivation at the time of her death, but the land is capable of affording a fair return for labour; a short time since, some of the before named free people (who were all of them very able and capable of working) put in a small quantity of provisions and cotton, but not sufficient to maintain one person without some other means. Generally speaking both men and women are very idle and dissipated. They own no stock, nor does any one of them reside on their own land; indeed it is a matter of astonishment, how they are able to subsist without more industry and labour; and it is most extraordinary that not one of the people manumitted by Mrs. Harragin possess a house or dwelling of their own.

Tortola, March 16th, 1824. DANIEL FRAZER.

Thus, my Lord, it is obvious, that out of twenty-five slaves emancipated by Mr. Nottingham, twenty, it appears, have died without issue. *None of the males had any issue.* Instead of "*intermarrying with each other*," two of them, (indeed I may say only one) of *them* are married! Of the boasted *natural increase*, the whole has been produced by *illegitimate connexions*, formed with other free persons and with slaves, not only not Nottinghams, but not even related to them. From the preceding minute and accurate statement, it is as obvious as the sun at noonday, when the atmosphere is clear, that they have decreased *eighteen*, or rather *twenty-two*, out of twenty-five manumitted, instead of being increased nineteen or twenty. *Three only survive*, for unless *Anglus* can prove that the father of *Jeffry*, who is married to *Frett*, was a *Nottingham*, neither himself nor his issue, three children, can be admitted to belong to the Nottinghams. In that case, the *decrease* will be twenty-two, and with regard to the remainder of the "*natural increase*," *Anglus*, my Lord, may just as well claim that progeny as his progeny, as set it down the progeny of the Nottinghams. The statement, therefore, made in my work, that the greater part of those people died without issue, that the males, wherever they may have formed temporary connexions, connected themselves with female slaves, and were thus saved the trouble of providing

for any offspring they might have, and that many of them were dependant upon slaves for support, is to the letter correct; and the charge brought against myself, and the statement I made; as put forward by *Anglus* in the *New Times*, Sept. 23d, is altogether wrong, and contrary to the truth. To evince that truth, and truth only, is my object, I have here done what there was no reason for me to do, brought forward my own name, and the name of my authorities, against an anonymous writer, writing also upon the authority of anonymous correspondents. Having done so, I challenge *Anglus* to arraign or disprove my authorities, and I now call, and have a right to call upon him to produce his name, subscribed to narratives substantiated with the real signatures of his informants. I call upon him to do this; for, if he refrains from doing this, he himself will affix, by his silence, the brand of misrepresentation (to give it no harsher name) to his statements.

I would implore your Lordship to look at this statement. I would entreat the British public, and the British Legislature to peruse it, to compare it with the bold and unfounded narratives put forward by our Anticolonists upon ANONYMOUS AUTHORITY, and, having considered the subject, to remember the guides that would lead them into the paths of error, loss, and degradation. So far from the statement put forward by *Anglus* and his associates, being correct, it is in almost every instance at variance with truth, and made in opposition to the information of ONE, at least, of the gentlemen whose authority they affect to quote. Such conduct requires from me, no comment nor reprobation. The public, except that portion of it, which considers that the end justifies the means, will supply the commentary and reprobation which I omit. What the NOTTINGHAMS, &c. are, my Lord, the slaves emancipated in ALL our Colonies would become, indolent, idle, poor, and wretched—worse, not better, and from ALL those possessions, so situated, we should export of Colonial produce, what the Nottinghams export from Tortola—NONE!! I am, &c.

JAMES MACQUEEN.

Glasgow, 8th October, 1824.

COLONIAL CONTROVERSY.

No. III.

APPRENTICED AFRICANS.

To the Right Honourable the Earl of Liverpool.

My Lord,

Were an examination, similar to that noted in my second letter, regarding the enfranchised negroes in Tortola, gone into in every other Island, the result would be similar, I know, from personal knowledge, and since I left the West Indies, from authority which has no object to deceive or mislead, that the situation of the free negroes in general, is distressing. Many have neither house nor home, nor food, nor raiment, nor education, and are, in general, dependant upon slaves for victuals to support their existence, and houses in which to hide their heads; or else the idle but profligate among them, make their abodes the receptacle of runaway slaves and stolen property. They also encourage the slaves to desert, that they may get them to labour for them. In this general description, there are, no doubt, exceptions, but, compared to the whole, they are, indeed, few in number. Let the matter be inquired into, and the truth of what I here state, will be made abundantly manifest.

Strictly connected with my subject, is the system adopted of civilizing Africa and Africans, by making the population of Africa, wherever found, apprentices, without once requiring their consent. The scheme was devised and counselled by my opponent, *Anglus*, "his friends and admirers;" and, as such, it comes properly under review, in order to point out another instance of the complete failure of their idle theories with regard to Africa. In Sierra Leone the scheme has completely failed, and, in the FACE OF THE LAW, was abandoned as im-

practicable. In the West Indies, as I shall presently shew, the scheme has also utterly failed of its object.

Anglus, in his Letter, No. 2, *New Times*, September 10th, in the simplicity of his heart, or in the strength of his cunning, affects to feel surprise at, and cannot conceive why negroes, who accumulated and were able to accumulate property when they were slaves, should cease to do so when they are free—their own masters, and living, as we in Scotland would say, "*upon their own pok neuk*." The conduct of the soldier and the sailor, when released from strict control, and left to provide for themselves, may tend to enlighten the mind, and remove the doubts of *Anglus* on this subject; and, if that will not do, he may visit our sponging-houses and houses of correction, and our tread-mills, and there ascertain why mankind prefer idleness and dissipation, to labour. The negro, while a slave, is in a state of subjection. He is forced to be industrious for his master's interest, which keeps him out of the way of extravagance and dissipation. Amongst well-disposed slaves, this control teaches them to be industrious for their own interest. When emancipated, they are no longer under control. Hence negroes, who had property when slaves, are found in a state of wretchedness when free. But this is not all. When slaves, their master finds them in every thing—food, clothing, house, house-furniture, implements of husbandry, attendance when sick, every thing, in short, equal to all their wants, besides land to cultivate, and time to work it, without any thing to pay in return. Public burdens and taxes are unknown to the slave—they press not on him—good and bad markets touch him not—and in good and bad times, his wants are equally and regularly supplied. The moment he is emancipated, however, he loses all these advantages, and is affected, and seriously affected, by prosperous or unprosperous times. In sickness, he must look to his own resources; he has land to purchase or to rent, a house to build, and a house to furnish; if a family, he has them to support, clothe, feed, and maintain; all of whom were previously provided for and supported by his master—he has clothes to find, food to provide, agricultural seeds and implements to buy, and public taxes to pay, with only the pro-

ceeds of his own labour, to enable him to furnish all his wants, and meet all his engagements. The average proceeds of the labour of free people in Tortola, from an accurate document in my possession, is calculated at four pounds six shillings per annum, from land and stock. Let *Anglus*, who knows debtor and creditor well, place this on the one side of his sheet, and the expenses for all the outlay which the emancipated negro, as above enumerated, would have to bear, but which slaves have not to bear, on the other side of his sheet, and then say how much they would have to receive, or rather how much they would be in debt at the end of the year. From such an account, carefully compiled, he would be at no loss whatever, to ascertain how a negro may be wealthy when a slave, and poor as the Nottinghams are poor, after they have been emancipated.

With these observations, I proceed to bring before your Lordship, the state of the apprenticed African negroes, and whose indentures are now about expiring. The sources from whence I draw my information, are the same as those I have already mentioned. The questions put to different individuals of integrity and intelligence in Tortola, on this subject, I shall first insert. That I may not, however, extend this letter beyond due bounds, I shall content myself with extracting the answer of one gentleman only, to each question.

" Questions proposed, and asked, to ascertain the opinions of disinterested persons, as to the general character, state, and condition, of the African apprentices; and how far their residence, when free, will be attended with danger, or expense to the community—in July, 1823.

1st, Do you hold any public situation or appointment in Tortola; have you any African apprentices now in your employment as indented servants; do you own any slaves, and if so, how many?

2d, How long have you resided in Tortola, and have you had any opportunities to observe the general character and conduct of the African apprentices indented in this Island, more especially as to their industry, and whether the degree of industry is steady and continued, or uncertain and desultory; have you observed the result of their application to agricultural industry; and if so, please to state what you have observed, more particularly as to the quantity of land cultivated, produce raised, and time bestowed in the cultivation thereof?

3d, Do you think, under the present circumstances of Tortola, that the African apprentices would be able to support themselves; and that they would

be inclined to do so generally by honest industry, when freed from the present control over them by their masters or mistresses; and what is the present situation of free people situated as they would be, and solely dependant on their own industry, in trades or in agricultural labours?

4th. From your experience, do you think the free black people solely dependant on their own industry, as stated in the preceding question, would be likely to receive the African apprentices into their class of society; and what appears to you to be the state of feeling between the African apprentices and the other classes of the community, whether free or slaves?"

ANSWERS OF JOHN GIBBES, ESQ.

"2d, I have resided for upwards of 18 years in Tortola, and have had a peculiar opportunity of observing the conduct of the African apprentices, in consequence of living in that part of the town where they commonly muster or lounge, to seek occasional employment as porters or boatmen, to talk, dance, fight, &c. Many of the females possess steady and persevering industry, and exert themselves in earning, as washers or house-drudges, more than their daily wants require. The males are (with some few exceptions,) by no means so industrious, their exertions seldom extending beyond what may be necessary to obtain the means of satisfying their immediate wants; they will not, if left to themselves, remain at labour, be it ever so profitable to them, many days together; both males and females, in general are passionate, quarrelsome, and noisy to excess; it requiring but little provocation to make them cut and stab each other with knives or any thing else which may be at hand; I have not had an opportunity of observing the result of Agricultural industry of those Africans apprenticed to persons residing in the country, but those in and about town have little or no turn for agricultural pursuits—a small piece of land, not exceeding three acres, is cultivated by 10 or 12 of them, apprenticed to one person; very little of their time is bestowed upon it. I cannot form an idea of the quantity or value of the provisions raised, but it must be trifling.

4th. Free persons of colour, as well as Slaves, hold Africans in such contempt, that there is not the least hope of their being amalgamated with any class of coloured people already free, or Slaves likely to become free. This, in addition to an envious hatred on the part of the slaves against a class of beings, they consider so much their inferiors (but who nevertheless enjoy freedom) has generated such a state of feeling, as I am satisfied will produce, at no remote period, serious disquietude in the community. Under these circumstances, I am decidedly of opinion that the situation of these people, let loose at the expiration of their apprenticeship will be truly pitiable."

ANSWERS OF RICHARD KING, SEN. ESQ

1st. I am a member of the Commons House of Assembly, a Magistrate and Registrar of Slaves. I have no African apprentices now in my employment; I had two, a young woman and a boy indented to me in the year 1814 or 1815; the former I had instructed to be a washer, by a free woman who washed for my family. After three years she was completed in that art, and promised to do well, I then made her the sole washer, and required no other services from her.

In about a year after, she became idle and indifferent about her washing, which she persevered in for a couple of years; at length I was so dissatisfied, that I called on the Collector to request he would transfer the indentures to another person, which he did. The boy was a great thief; I applied to the collector also, who bound him to a carpenter to teach him that art. I own twenty slaves.

ANSWERS OF DR. JOHN STOBO.

3d. I am of opinion that the body of the African apprentices would not be qualified to support themselves by honest industry, if freed from the control of their masters and mistresses, in fact it is the poorer class who chiefly accept of the services of the African apprentices, the others, considering their labour, even after seven years' service, as not equivalent to their food, clothing, medical attendance; many of them have solicited me to take them, but I have declined to do so from these very reasons.

I OWN NO SLAVES.

The present situation of the free black people, with few exceptions, is by no means superior to that of slaves on most estates. They are neither so well fed nor housed. In advanced age many of them are dependant on charity for their support, few indeed of the free black or coloured people are inclined to follow agriculture, they generally prefer huckstering and hawking about for their support, in preference to following any regular or steady employment; those who have learnt trades are seldom steady in following their business."

[In addition to these particulars, Mr. Frazer, the gentleman already referred to, authorizes me to use the following clear and convincing account of the true situation of these people.]

" The number of Africans now here, who have been condemned to His Majesty, under the abolition laws, is very large for so small a Colony—and are found to be a great encumbrance. In short, they may, in many respects, be considered as a complete nuisance at the present time, and if permitted to remain here after the term of their apprenticeship shall have expired, will, most certainly become not only a great burthen, but will also be very dangerous to this community. They are (with a few exceptions) idle, licentious, quarrelsome, revengeful, and prone to dishonesty; have no fixed habits of industry in any particular kind of employment, when left to exercise their own judgment, or to follow the bias of their inclinations, as is the case with a large proportion of them; in general, they appear to dislike agricultural employment above all others—and do but little therein when it can be avoided. Many of them have been indented to persons in very limited circumstances, who cannot, at all times, afford to maintain them; others are so disorderly and ill-behaved, testifying so much impatience of control, from considering themselves free, and therefore, upon a footing with, and entitled to all the privileges of other free black persons on the island, that their masters and mistresses would be glad to get rid of them altogether, but cannot, and some there are, who, from various causes, are without either masters or mistresses, and for whom none can be found. Such only excepted, as could not be considered eligible persons to be intrusted with the charge of people in their situation; the consequence of which is, that the most of all those are permitted to do just as they please, and to employ themselves in any way they may think proper to procure a maintenance. The masters and mistresses (where they

have any) only calling upon them occasionally to perform some little service, or expecting to receive hire for some part of their time; that, however, is an expectation seldom realized. The little restraint under which so many of these people have been for a length of time, has afforded me numberless opportunities to discover their general character to be as before stated; as also to convey an accurate idea of their industry, and to what a degree it extends. The generality of them spend the greater part of their time in idleness; if they can but obtain any casual employment for a few days together, it seems to be the utmost of what they then desire, and do not again seem anxious to work until their earnings have been exhausted, and they begin to feel want, when, if no other employment presents itself to their view, they depend on the little they are enabled to obtain, by trespassing on the lands of different persons contiguous to town, in cutting wood and Guinea grass for sale, making up the deficiency of what is required for their subsistence, by gathering sour-sops and other uncultivated fruits, and often are detected in breaking canes and committing other depredations.

If the African apprentices now here were, at this present time, altogether free from the control of those to whom they have been indented, or who have the care of them, they could not, under the present circumstances of the island, support themselves *by honest industry*; nor doth it appear, from what hath been already stated, that they would, generally speaking, be inclined to do so, if they could. The men, or rather some of them, would occasionally by employed as porters, boatmen, messengers, &c. but not so constantly as to afford them a sufficient support; some of the females also would, no doubt, be employed as washers, and by hucksters, to carry out their tray with articles for sale, &c. but with respect to all the others, both male and female, it would be for them to discover a mode by which they could obtain a livelihood. It is difficult to say what would be their situation; or what would be the consequences resulting from such situations.

The free black people of this island (now very numerous) whose dependance on support rests wholly on their industry in trades, or agriculture, or manual labour in some other way, a great number of them having neither trades, nor lands to cultivate, are mostly in a complete state of misery; the situation of ninety-nine out of a hundred of the slaves in this island is enviable, compared with many of theirs, who are at times in want of every thing, not only in any degree comfortable, but absolutely necessary to the preservation of their existence, and were it not for the relief which they occasionally get from others, often from slaves, with whom family and other connexions exist, they could not survive.

Exclusive of a great number of others, under various different circumstances, some comfortably situated, and conducting themselves with the greatest propriety, and others quite the reverse, there are in the colony from 60 to 70 free black persons, who own upwards of 200 acres of good land in different parts of it, of which number of people it is a well authenticated fact, that not more than three or four depend principally (but not altogether) on the produce of their land for support, and that very few only of the others, are cultivators at all, and they but of small patches, in very favourable weather, or when compelled by necessity to turn their attention, thereto, as their last resort; and very often, when they got a chance of doing any thing else, that will afford them an immediate sup-

port, *the cultivation is neglected*, and they reap not the fruits of the little labour which they had bestowed on it; for if they can, in any other way, get enough to live on, *they never attend to agriculture;* they go to sea on short voyages, gather salt in dry weather, cut wood for sale, catch fish, make fish pots and nets, for their own use, and for sale, &c. &c.

DAN. FRASER."

From these narratives, my Lord, I pass to the official reports of official persons drawn up for, and given in to, the Commissioners already alluded to in obedience to their commands, and published by order of the House of Commons.

In the first place, it may not be unimportant to state, that many of the Africans apprenticed in Tortola absconded, and went to St. Thomas, where they were sold as slaves under the Danish laws. Persons of property refused to take these people under their charge, as all the work they did would not defray the expense they occasioned. Of their situation in Dominica, Judge Gloster says to the Commissioners, "At present they are without religion or moral discipline, and under no superintendence and restraint; following the dictates of their own blind minds and impetuous passions; and you can, Gentlemen, very well judge, from your knowledge of mankind, of what little utility to themselves or to the state, such half-savages can be. I know of none employed in the country upon sugar, coffee, or provision estates."

"As far as this community is concerned, and more especially as we cannot say to what extent this anomalous population may be hereafter carried, there can be but one sentiment, which is, that their removal would be beneficial. The few we have are, I understand, an idle, drunken, noisy, quarrelsome, fighting race, of no use to our internal force, not being called, as other free blacks, to discharge militia duties; indeed they are of that class that might, in case of insurrection or invasion, be dangerous. They are, moreover, the cause of angry and jealous feelings in the bosoms of the field and domestic slaves, who view with envious eyes, persons of their own black complexions, much more ignorant, uncivilized, unlawful and tumultuous than themselves, their own masters, and labouring or not labouring, just as suits their own convenience. (Report, papers No. 442, p. 26.)

Upon the death of persons in the Colonies, intestate or

without heirs, their effects, real or personal, become the property of His Majesty. In this way different negroes have come into the possession of His Majesty, like the captured and apprenticed negroes. Their situation, bereft of their former masters, while they cost this country heavy sums, is deplorable, and arising, according to the accounts, from their vicious dispositions. Thus, of eight slaves of this description in Antigua, Mr. Horsford, the Casual Receiver, reports, (return to House of Commons paper, No. 423, p. 7.) "It was with difficulty I could collect them; their characters were and are very bad, and they are *perpetually committing some crime.*" The father of three of them "petitioned the Governor, to be allowed to purchase their freedom, but I understand his Excellency has been since deterred from so doing, by the badness of their characters." Drs. Murray and Crauford, have a claim of £100 against the former Receivers, for medical attendance upon these eight individuals, and the claim of the present Receiver for maintaining them for two years and a half, is £207: 2*s.* 6*d.* currency. From these things it appears, that His Majesty has an idle but expensive set of subjects, if such they can be called, in our Colonies, and that the free Africans in them are the most idle and dissipated, and indolent of mankind. The habits of Negroes, when left to themselves, are very little different any where. "The voyage across the Atlantic," as Mr. Brougham very forcibly observed, (*Edin. Rev.* vol. 1st, p. 255,) will not civilize the Ethiopian, nor change his habits of indolence, nor inspire him with a love of labour which he abhors." No certainly!

What the liberated and apprenticed Africans in the West Indies are, my Lord, *all* the slaves of African origin, and all those removed from it by one generation at least, together with a considerable number of the Creoles, would, if *now* emancipated, become, leaving perhaps *a fourth* of the most intelligent and industrious to be plundered, corrupted, oppressed and overwhelmed by the others. Such, even those intelligent slaves say, would be the result of the emancipating scheme of *Anglus*. I am, &c.

JAMES MACQUEEN.

Glasgow, 11*th October*, 1824.

COLONIAL CONTROVERSY.

No. IV.

STEELE'S CASE.

To the Right Honourable the Earl of Liverpool.

My Lord,

Every one who attempts to oppose, with the voice of truth, the present anticolonial mania, must lay his account to be denounced as an enemy to the human race, by *interested* dealers in human liberty. The mind, however, that is conscious of the rectitude of its intentions, scorns such miserable sophistry, and all such strides to despotic authority.

"West Indian slaves," says Mr. Clarkson, p. 9. "must do, and that *instantaneously*, whatever their master orders them to do, WHETHER IT BE RIGHT OR WRONG. His will, and his will alone, is their law. If the wife of a slave were ordered by his master to submit herself TO HIS LUSTS, or her husband were ordered to STEAL FOR HIM, neither the one nor the other dare to disobey his commands." "The whip, the shackles, and the dungeon," says Mr. Steele, "are at all times in his power, whether to gratify his lust, or display his authority."

This outrageous statement, my Lord, is utterly false. I defy Mr. Clarkson to produce one authenticated instance where authority could be so exercised with impunity, or, in fact, where it ever was exercised in the manner and for the objects described. This cruel libel upon the character of a community, I reprobated and yet reprobate. And because I did so—because I stepped forward to oppose and expose the danger and the malevolence of such statements—because I would not succumb to falsehood, and advocate the cause of error and injustice, *Anglus* thinks proper to charge me with "asperity, prejudice, misstatements, exaggerations, and misrepresentations,"—of the very errors of which he himself is guilty.

The mention of Mr. Steele's name brings me to consider his case. In my notice of it in my Work, *Anglus* accuses me of "*extreme unfairness.*" With what truth he does so will immediately appear.

When I answered the statements made concerning this gentleman's plans, it must be recollected, and *Anglus* knew well, that I answered (as the title of my publication clearly shews) only the statements put forward by himself and his fellows. I had not then seen the publication they pretended to take as their authority, namely, "Dickson's Mitigation of Slavery," &c. That Book, however, now lies before me, and a more confused and irrational mass of nonsense on Colonial subjects was never before collected together. Important facts are concealed and distorted, in order to support theoretical views.

Will your Lordship—can this country credit the fact, that the statements brought forward by Mr. Clarkson and his coadjutors, as data to guide the Administration and the Legislature of this country, are taken from pages filled with supposed cases, imaginary dialogues, and contained in letters under anonymous signatures, inserted forty years ago, in a Barbadoes Newspaper! Yet so it is—can *Anglus* deny it!

Nor is this all, my Lord. Mr. Clarkson, and, after him, his followers, the *Edinburgh Review*, and *Anglus*, take these anonymous and imaginary effusions as authority, in preference to a narrative to which Mr. *Steele's* signature is attached. Thus they assert, that from 1784 to 1786 inclusive, Mr. Steele's estate, *under his new system*, yielded in neat returns, one half (2 per cent.) more than it did during the average of the four preceding years. Now at page 11, Mr. Steele himself says, that under his new system, which new system was the taking the whips from the drivers, and instituting Negro Courts of justice, "MY CROPS SUNK ALMOST TO NOTHING; and *every thing* was done so much out of time, that many species of produce *never came to perfection, but wasted away, choked up with weeds!*" This mischief Mr. Steele endeavours indeed to fix upon a superintendent, who, it is asserted, refused to abide by his plans, but it is quite evident, even from Mr. Steele's way of telling the tale (page 10.) that the mischief was brought about by his

rash schemes, and that this superintendent distinctly intimated to Mr. Steele, "that he held himself in no way accountable for the ill condition of the estate and its RUINOUS CROPS, for that he could obtain no labour from the Negroes." However, it is with the fact of the DECREASED, not *increased* produce during that period, that I have at present to do, and which *Anglus* has not only kept out of view, but stated the reverse as the fact of the case.

The boldness with which Mr. Clarkson and *Anglus* wrest language and statements to suit their purpose, is scarcely credible. Thus they assert, that Mr. Steele's abundant crop and surplus produce of Guinea Corn in 1790, was entirely owing to his copyhold system. Mr. Steele himself (Dickson, page 18, and Clarkson, page 41,) distinctly states, that it proceeded from a more rigorous system of Government, under which "watchmen were obliged to pay for all losses that had happened on their watch"—in consequence of which "he had much less STOLEN FROM HIM THAN BEFORE this new Government took place"—that is under his *other* new Government, when he took away the whips from the drivers, &c.—and set Negroes on Courts and Juries to try, condemn, and punish one another! It was then that the thieving and idleness were most active.

But let us examine a little more closely the accuracy of those who are for ever accusing others of inaccuracy. "The only knowledge, says *Anglus*, Letter, No. 6, *New Times*, Sept. 28th, which we have of Mr. Steele's plan *(the Copyhold System)* is from the letters of Mr. Steele himself, contained in Dickson's Mitigation of Slavery, &c." "Of the experiment detailed by Mr. Clarkson, nothing is known from any authentic source, except during a period of seven years, namely, from 1783, when it FIRST COMMENCED to 1790. There is no authority with which I am acquainted, to shew that it was continued beyond the year 1790." *Anglus* would make an excellent Jesuit. "There is no authority with which *I am* acquainted" is worthy of the cause. Why not make himself acquainted with authority? Does not Mr. Sealy say it was continued? Mr. Haynes says it was continued; and the *Quarterly Review* says it was continued. And are these no authorities? But let us

refer to *Dickson's* book, which *Anglus* admits to be "*authority.*" In page 66, we find a letter from *Mr. Steele*, dated, November 9th, 1790, wherein he says, "my Copyhold slaves will all be settled on this estate, in their tenements, before Christmas. The survey and division of the land, have taken up some time, but are now almost completed." Yet the accurate *Anglus*, affects to tell us, upon the authority of that very book, that the Copyhold system began in 1783, when it did not begin till 1790! Mr. Dickson, preface, p. 24, supposes, that Mr. Steele died after the close of the year, 1790, as he never heard from him after that year, and, taking Dickson for his authority, Mr. Clarkson, page 36, adds, "after having accomplished all he wished, *he died in the year* 1791, in the 91st year of his age!" I produced and published, my Lord, a copy of Mr. Steele's last will, dated and signed, October 23d, 1796!! *Has Anglus attempted to deny the fact?* No.

Mr. Steele's Copyhold scheme, began in 1790, and Mr. Steele's letter, (p. 66.) already quoted, expressly states, "when I return (to England it is supposed) which, however, I cannot think of doing for a year or two more; as I MUST STAY to see the government of my copyholders thoroughly confirmed *by experience*, and by some act of Legislative power." Neither *Anglus*, nor *Mr. Dickson*, therefore, could be ignorant that the system was intended to be continued beyond 1790, and, it is not at all probable, that Mr. Dickson remained in ignorance that it was continued, and that it was unsuccessful. That Gentleman has given me sure data to determine his disingenuity on this point. He drops Mr. Steele's scheme at its commencement. In like manner, he drops the experiment of cultivation by the plough, on Westerhall Estate, Grenada, in the year 1794, after which, he affects to know nothing more about it, though, till that period, he asserts that it was eminently successful.

My Lord, I know Westerhall Estate, Grenada, well—every cane hole in it. I had the charge of it for several years, when it belonged to the late Sir William Pulteney. I knew it from 1797, at the commencement of the cultivation, after the fatal rebellion. The plough was abandoned, because, on that Estate, it was found to accomplish no saving of expense, no accelera-

tion of labour, and because it added nothing to the crop, but more especially, because, that out of 1000 acres of land on the Estate, and these acres as fine cane land as are in the West Indies, there were not 50 acres that could be ploughed with any advantage. The remainder is so steep and stony, that it cannot be ploughed, and yet, in such places, grow the finest canes on the Estate. But these facts, it either did not suit Mr. Dickson's purpose to ascertain, or views to disclose. Of the extreme inaccuracy of his information, his statements, p. 294, abundantly testify, when he says, "in 1794, the French Revolutionary Brigands desolated the island of Grenada;" also that his friend, "Sir James Johnstone, died the same year, and *the estate passed into the hands of his brother*, the late Sir William Pulteney." The estate "passed," first, "into the hands" of Lady Johnstone; and, at her death, in 1797, it came into the hands of Sir William Pulteney. The rebellion also, which desolated Grenada, commenced, March 2d, 1795!! Such is Mr. Dickson's accuracy—such his disingenuity.

My Lord, the plans projected by Mr. Steele, to govern and ameliorate the state of his slaves, were as wild and visionary as those devised by Mr. Owen, to eradicate evil from amongst the human race.

The facts shortly are; Mr. Steele, greatly embarrassed, went to Barbadoes, in 1780. Totally ignorant of the business of a planter, he took the management of his estate into his own hands, and, with one new scheme after another, he succeeded in ruining the property, and most deeply injuring the slaves. Still, while doing this, I will admit, and believe he did express himself, that matters were going on to his satisfaction, a folly and blindness which we often observe in the world, amongst other enthusiastic schemers and reformers, ignorant of the materials with which they are labouring to accomplish their end.

At the outset, Mr. Steele's copyhold system was as follows:—

To each Slave of his *first* gang, he allotted half an acre of land for his subsistence, requiring them to labour for him, 260 days in the year, at 7½d. per day. To the *second* gang, he allotted a quarter of an acre of land to each, requiring them to labour for him, 276 days in the year, at 5d. per day; for the *third* gang, he paid over to the parents of each, 7½d. per

week. For the children he *provided nothing*, and gave them no allowance. They were maintained and clothed by their parents, till they entered the third gang. The aged and infirm, had no wages, but were left, if incapable of working for him, to work and feed themselves, from their half acre of land; but, if capable of a little light work, then to receive 1¼d. per week for it. This plan Mr. Steele afterwards altered, and at length finished the scheme, by settling the day's work to be ten hours, at the following wages—¼d. an hour for each negroe of the first gang—⅓d. per hour for each negroe of the second gang.—7½d. per week for each negroe of the third gang—and 3¾d. per week for each negro of the fourth gang.

Mr. Steele charged the negroes at £8 per acre, for the land allotted to them. His wages, to an able negroe per annum, were at the rate above-mentioned, £8: 2s: 6d.; out of which, the slave was obliged to supply himself with implements for labour, nay, house rent, food, clothing, *head levy*, (3s.) fines, (two days' wages for every day's absence) forfeitures, doctor's bills, &c.: so that any one who will take the trouble to calculate, will find, that at the end of the year, the slave must have been indebted to his master.

But this is not all—the Slaves were not paid in "the current coin" of the colony, as has been asserted. Mr. Steele got out from England, copper coin, with which he paid their wages, and which not being current any where else, they were compelled to bring it back to him in payment, for every article of provisions, such as corn, grain, yams, eddoes, potatoes, rum, molasses, rice, salt, salt-fish, &c. which they purchased from him.

Let us see how the affairs of Mr. Steele's negroes, would stand at the end of the year:—

DR.			CR.		
Rent land, ...	£1	10 0	1st Gang wages, ...	£8	2 6
Doctor's bill, ...	0	13 0			
House rent, only	1	0 0			
Clothing, hoes, &c.	1	15 0			
Salt-fish, 100 lbs.	1	15 6			
Beef and Pork, 8 lbs.	0	6 6			
Food, say only	4	0 0			
Head levy, ...	0	3 0			
	£11	3 0			

By such a dreadful system, it is clear the stoutest and ablest negroes must either have been in debt, or left to starve or steal,

while the less able, the young, the aged, and the infirm, must have been placed in a state of the greatest misery.

In answer to the statement adduced by Mr. Clarkson, and the *Edinburgh Review*, regarding the success of Mr. Steele's schemes, and the increased produce of his estate, I shewed, *First*, that the former was altogether erroneous, and that the latter, where it may have taken place, proceeded from higher prices of sugar, arising out of political causes with which Mr. Steele's plan had no connexion, and over which it has no control. *Secondly*, I shewed that the schemes, instead of increasing, decreased the produce of the estate. *Has Anglus shewn that what I stated was wrong?* NO! I stated that, under the operation of Mr. Steele's plan, his Slaves decreased greatly, that at his death, they were in a most wretched and disconsolate state, and rejoiced when his plans were done away. *Has Anglus contradicted one iota of this?* NO! I stated, that his boasted COPYHOLD system was not instituted by him, to ameliorate the condition of his negroes, but proceeded from embarrassment, want of funds and credit, and was adopted to prevent his creditors from getting hold of his property; and I stated this upon the authority of the late Mr. Beckles, His Majesty's Attorney-General for the Island,* who was Mr. Steele's legal

* Letter from Mr. Beckles, Barbadoes, to Joseph W. Jordan, Esq. London.

"Dear Sir, Barbadoes, August 1, 1823.

"I am now to acknowledge the receipt of yours of the 19th ult. by which you refer to me for information with respect to Mr. Steele and a Mr. Dickson, whose names are again brought forward to our prejudice, in the recent attempt to ruin us, by emancipating our slaves. Of Dickson I had never even heard, till my return to Barbadoes early in the year 1770, after an absence of nearly seven years in England. I found there was a man of the name making some noise in the country. He had been an obscure man, and lost an arm by the bursting of a cannon, which he was firing at some public rejoicing. He had possessed a few slaves, whom he had treated cruelly, and had got rid of them, either voluntarily or by compulsion, and then he set himself up as a violent opposer of slavery, and published several things against the inhabitants, some of which were true, and others grossly false.

"I knew something of Mr. Steele in England. About two years after my return he came to the island, and immediately *retained* me as one of his counsel, so that I became well acquainted with him and his views. Although his plantation was a very fine one, it had not been well managed, and he was involved in debt. He dreaded lest his negroes should be taken from him; he therefore set himself up to oppose the law which allows slaves to be attached for debt, and carried from

adviser at the time this scheme was devised. *Has Anglus contradicted my statement on this head?* NO! I stated that Mr. Steele's Estate, *(Kendal)* one of the finest in Barbadoes, was so embarrassed and ruined by Mr. Steele's theories and bad management, that it was brought to sale by the authority of the Court of Chancery, and that, after liquidating the claims against him, scarcely any reversion remained to his children. *Has Anglus contradicted, or even attempted to contradict these facts?* NO! I gave my authorities for my statements, viz.—Mr. Haynes, Mr. Sealy, and Mr. Beckles, Gentlemen personally acquainted with Mr. Steele, his property, and his affairs. *Has Anglus impeached these authorities?* NO! He malignantly insinuates, that Mr. Sealy may have been one of those men discharged by Mr. Steele, because they would not walk by his instructions. Mr. Sealy distinctly informs us, that he resided in the neighbourhood of Mr. Steele's property, when the plans were in operation. Mr. Sealy is known to be a most respectable man. The mean insinuation thrown out by *Anglus*, is worthy of himself and of his cause.

It would be spending time to little purpose, to wade through the voluminous productions of such erring authorities. The fact the public is interested in, is the success or failure of Mr. Steele's scheme. The failure was most complete. He

off the soil. He was also desirous of avoiding the payment of his debts, and he set himself up in opposition to all the laws of the island.

Mr. Steele instituted what he called a *copyhold system*, for the management of his plantation. His slaves were to be paid hire for the work they did. He allowed them a small pittance for every hour that they worked, but they paid for every thing—house rent, doctor's attendance, medicine, clothes and food, and in short, every thing they desired to have, he supplied them with, and deducted the price out of their hire. *They had not the option* of working, or letting it alone. They were obliged to work, and upon his plantation; if they did not, he not only stopped their hire, but they were punished either by a flogging or imprisonment. Mr. Steele soon found that it was by far the cheapest way of managing the plantation.

"I was surprised to see it asserted lately in print, that his plantation succeeded well under that management.—*I know it to be false*—it failed considerably; and had he lived a few years longer, he would not have died worth a farthing. Upon his death they reverted to the old system, to which the slaves readily and willingly returned; the plantation now succeeds, and the slaves are contented and happy, and think themselves much better off than under the copyhold system, for their wages would not afford them many comforts which they have now."

went to Barbadoes in 1780. From his own account (*Dickson*, p. 157,) he had 288 negroes, in June 1780. In 1783, he tells us, (*Dickson*, p. 101,) that he had only 246, which gives a decrease of 42 in three years, even while the estate was under his own direction, for he directed it from the day he landed on the island till the day of his death, as *Anglus* cannot fail to know, because at page 5, he especially states, "*I had not been three months on my estate, &c.*" The disingenuity on this point displayed in the anonymous letters alluded to, is very reprehensible. The diminution is set down at 42—the number of births 15—of deaths 57. But the destruction by the great hurricane is not taken into account. In page 52, Mr. Steele tells us it was 8 per cent. in the whole Island. In p. 62, we find the decrease, from 1779 to 1783, on the whole island to be 6486, above ten per cent. That the hurricane and famines in consequence, were the cause of the great decrease of slaves on Mr. Steele's estate, during the period mentioned, cannot admit of a doubt.—This view of the case is borne out by referring to Dickson, page 62, where Mr. Steele certifies the decrease of negroes in the whole island for the year, ending Aug. 30, 1784, as only 450, in a population of about 71,000!

Taking the period of three years, from 1783 to 1786 inclusive, to contrast with the returns from Mr. Steele's estate, for ten years preceding, is most erroneous and deceitful. With the exception of 1782, the whole of the ten years alluded to, were one continued scene of severe misfortune and disaster. The CANE ANT and the BORER, desolated the island, and destroyed the crops for several years preceding 1780. The great hurricane in that year desolated the colony, and swept every thing with confusion and destruction. The American war commenced in 1776, and cut off not only supplies of lumber and staves for the sugar crops, but provisions for the population, and raised all supplies to an enormous price. A frightful famine ensued in 1777, which Dickson thus describes, p. 309, but which, neither himself, Mr. Steele, nor *Anglus*, has the candour to notice, or take into account:—"Alarm was succeeded by despair. The famine had begun. The poor of the land, *both white and black*, were drop-

ping down *in the streets*, or silently *pining and expiring* in their cottages. Labour was in a great measure suspended. Some allowed their slaves to shift as they could in the day, provided they came home and slept in their cabins at night. Others collected them in the field, and let them work as they pleased. It was altogether an afflicting scene; and one's own little sufferings were forgotten in the general distress." On the other hand, from 1783 to 1786, the island was in a state of prosperity. The return of peace brought not only American supplies cheap and in abundance, but the rum, &c. which went to pay for them, rose to a high price, whereas, during the former period, there was no outlet for it. The returns from property, therefore, must have been greatly increased. Equally disingenuous is it to stop with crop, 1786, because in that year the island was again visited by a hurricane, and a famine which cut off about 15,000 negroes, (*Dickson*, p. 313,) and rendered great outlay necessary in future years. "The negroes," says Dickson, "had been so debilitated by former want, that they sunk under the return of famine, *and dropped off in numbers*."

The decrease of slaves and bad returns, therefore, from Mr. Steele's estate, it is clear took place under his own management, and were, no doubt, greatly aggravated by Mr. Steele's ignorance in the mode of managing an estate, by his theoretic plans, by his want of credit, and by the want of means for procuring supplies.

My Lord, it is not only disingenuous, but dishonest and dangerous, to conceal such facts and draw conclusions from contrasts taken without them. No writer, whose objects were truth and plain dealing, would do so.

With these observations I dismiss Mr. Steele, his case and his advocates, to that state of oblivion from which they should never have been drawn to insult this nation, and to attempt to mislead the Government. I am, &c.

JAMES MACQUEEN.

Glasgow, 13*th Octr.* 1824.

COLONIAL CONTROVERSY.

No. V.

BRANDING.—EXPLAINED.

To the Right Honourable the Earl of Liverpool.

My Lord,

Before entering upon the subjects more immediately connected with this letter, I may be permitted to observe, that the statement which I made regarding the Nottinghams, was drawn from three sources of information, one of which I stated in a note, was incomplete, but which was to be more fully detailed at another opportunity, after my informant had returned to Tortola.* The *tail* of this statement, *Anglus*,

* The person alluded to has fulfilled his promise, and lately transmitted me a more complete account of these matters. Domestic affliction, however, has for some time back prevented me from turning my attention to that and other information I have obtained. The narrative I have received from the quarter alluded to, *confirms* all that I had from the same source stated in my work, with one exception. The man who was challenged in Court with a gold button in the neck of his shirt, and the property of one of the Counsel present, which had been stolen by a female slave with whom the man cohabited, was not one of the Nottinghams, but a man named David Ham. So far, *but no farther*, is *Anglus* right and my information wrong. In getting out of one scrape, however, *Anglus* gets into another. He affects not to know that the sleeve button was stolen. I state it was. It had the name of the owner upon it, and *who took it back*. *Anglus* states in Letter No. 5, that Ham's wife was not a slave but a free woman, named Frett. That Ham has a wife of this name is very probable, but he cohabits, if he has such, with other women, and Mr. Fraser, who also notices this subject, says, "*Naomi Vanterpool lives with* Ham," that is, she is his *mistress*. This *Anglus* carefully conceals! Ham, therefore, like other descendants of *him* of the name, generally accounted their great progenitor—Keeps "a BLACK OR A BROWN MISTRESS" if not two "IN THE FACE OF HIS WIFE AND FAMILY." But then Ham, the dear creature, is black, and hence let him do what he will, he may calculate upon *Anglus* at least, stepping forward to defend his cause, and proclaim his praise.

with the ferocity of an African tiger, has fastened upon; but the other statement, the stronger of the two, and on which the case depended, he has left not only untouched but unnoticed. Mr. Macaulay knows it is unassailable.

The boldness with which *Anglus* accuses others of misrepresentation and misstatement ought to lead him to steer clear of such errors. In Letter No. 5, *New Times*, Sept. 23, defending his Nottingham bubble, he says, "No NOTTINGHAM ever prosecuted any gentleman in the Courts of Tortola for an ASSAULT AND BATTERY in his own person."—In "the substance of the debate on Mr. Buxton's motion, published last year, and I believe from the same pen, and at page 236-237, the writer says, "During the whole period since their emancipation, only one of them *once obtained* a warrant against a person who had ASSAULTED HIM, who begged his pardon and was forgiven." If this is not a prosecution—a trial—"an assault and battery in his person," I know not what assault and battery is.

I come now to the question of branding Negroes, wherein *Anglus* attempts to find "abundant proof of incorrectness" on my part. In proof of this, he adduces, from the *Jamaica Gazette* of the 26th June last, a list of ten Creole slaves, advertised with brand marks, but how, when, *where*, or *wherefore* so branded is not once hinted at. *Anglus*, with all that disingenuous sophistry, so conspicuous in his labours, does not, and *dares not*, tell his readers that this list is picked out from a general jail list of criminal "DESERTERS" and on whom the brands were in all probability fixed for still more serious and repeated offences. The disingenuity of the statement and reference, it is now my business to expose, and to shew on whose side misrepresentations and misstatements lie. But to do this the whole case must be taken, my Lord; all that I stated, and wherefore I stated what I did state, and not the garbled, meagre extract adduced by *Anglus*. The original anticolonial statement runs thus, and I dare *Anglus* to deny it.

"Many of the slaves are (ALL MAY BE) branded *like cattle* by means of a HOT IRON, on the shoulder or other conspicuous parts of the body, with the initials of their master's name,

and thus bear about them, in indelible characters, the proof of their debased and degraded state."

The charge here made is general and sweeping against all the West Indies—a *hot iron* the instrument, and the slaves are asserted to be marked with it every where and at pleasure, *because they are slaves*, and considered in the same light as "*cattle*." This, my Lord, is certainly the purport and meaning intended to be conveyed.

In answer to this, my Lord, I stated and I here again state, that "*as it is worded*," the paragraph is one of the bitterest calumnies and falsehoods ever penned." I further stated, that from my own personal knowledge of several of the Windward Islands, and from every information I could gain of the other small islands, no such practice existed or was known to exist among slaves, even the most criminal of slaves. Has this statement been denied or proven to be incorrect? NO! *Anglus* has not ventured upon that part of the subject. In these islands, Windward and Leeward, there are 400,000 slaves, or FOUR-SEVENTHS of our colonial slave population. Here then, my Lord, is the preponderance on the side of truth at once placed in my scale, and with this remark I proceed to advert to Jamaica, on which *Anglus* fixes, and where the remaining *three-sevenths* of our slave population dwell.

Anglus, it appears, reads the *Glasgow Courier*, and is not therefore ignorant that what I stated with regard to Jamaica, I stated from the information of others. My reply and statement on this head were, that no slaves were marked since the abolition or foreign importation was prohibited. Has *Anglus* shewn that what I said was untrue? NO! I stated, that, previous to the abolition, it was customary in some cases to mark newly imported negroes with the initials of their master's name, and I stated that this was done from humane motives, lest the slave, a total stranger and ignorant of the languages generally known, should stray or abscond, and not be able to give any account of himself, when serious consequences might ensue. Has *Anglus* attempted to shew that this account was wrong? NO! I stated, that, instead of the operation of branding being performed by a "HOT IRON,"

or, as Mr. Buxton said, a "hot crow iron," it was performed by a silver plate, heated by spirits of wine, that it might discolour without excoriating the skin, which latter were it to do, the object would be destroyed for which it was intended, and that this operation, which was generally performed by a surgeon, occasioned scarcely any pain. Has *Anglus* attempted to shew that what I have stated on this head is untrue? NO? In Jamaica, I added, "No Creole slaves, or those who could fluently speak languages generally understood, were so marked." It is very obvious, my Lord, when I made this statement upon what I conceived, and still conceive good authority, that I was speaking of slaves in general, and not of *criminal* slaves. It behoved *Anglus* before he made the charge of "incorrectness" intentional, as he would insinuate it to be, to have shewn that the Creole slaves who were marked, were not criminal slaves; above all, that any Creole slaves who have been so marked, since the abolition, were not criminals; and moreover, that these slaves so marked, were natives of, or marked in Jamaica. *Anglus* cannot be so ignorant as not to know well, that there are a multitude of slaves in Jamaica, brought from the French islands, more especially St. Domingo, at the time its population fled from the horrors of insurrection, in which Colonies all slaves were marked—the newly imported *on the breast*, by a silver plate, in the manner already described, and criminals *on the shoulders*, with the letter V or *Gal.* the brand in this case being inflicted with a hot iron; also, that many slaves from the Spanish possessions, where they brand them all on the shoulders, were in Jamaica, and it behoved *Anglus* and his informants to discriminate these from the natives of Jamaica, before he said so much, or any thing, about error and incorrectness.

The people in Jamaica, and those who know Jamaica well, assert, that no Creole slaves *were* branded "*but such as were guilty of crimes and vices;*" that none have been branded since foreign importation ceased; and that there is a law against it.* They assert all these things, and I believe them, and certainly

* In proof of this, I select from the Jamaica Royal Gazette of October 1824, the following case and sentence, reported under the head "GRAND COURT," October 22d.

the vain declamation of *Anglus*, and his dishonest and partial statements, will not induce me to renounce this belief.

The very Gazette to which *Anglus* refers (Royal Gazette, June 26, 1824) affords abundant proof that the practice is not general. The list of "*Deserters*" in all the gaols and workhouses of that island as advertised for that week, amounted to 79. Of this number 33, viz. 19 Africans and 14 Creoles were marked, and 46, viz. 15 Africans and 31 Creoles, were *not marked;* thus showing a great preponderance in favour of the latter. About such places, also, it is fair to presume that the greatest number, probably the greater number that are in the Colony—of marked criminals—will be found. These things, however, it did not suit the purpose of *Anglus* to state. Nor *durst* he tell his readers, that the reference he made was to criminal slaves—to the in-

"Sentence—On William Lee, a blacksmith, for cruelly branding his female negro slave, named Patty, with a hot iron, to be committed to the county gaol of Middlesex for the space of four calendar months, and to pay a fine of 100*l.* to the Justices and Vestry of the parish of St. Catherine. The girl was declared free by the Court, and 10*l.* a year ordered to be paid to her for life."

Will *Anglus* deny the important facts which this reference establishes? Or can himself or Mr. Clarkson refute the following facts, advanced by a writer in the Jamaica Journal of Nov. 13th. 1824, in reply to the foul calumnies and exaggerations of the latter on this very head?

"Branding—In former times this was done for two objects; 1st, to new imported negroes who were ignorant of the language and country, and might lose their way or run away, and who could give no account of themselves; this was to facilitate their recovery; 2d, to Creole negroes, who happened to be incorrigible runaways. At present marking is punishable; and lately a person was fined 20*l.* for marking a negro.

As to the suffering in marking, it is a trifle, as only a blister is raised. It was done with a silver mark, held an instant over the flame of spirits, and the skin was first covered with oil. The pain did not equal that of an electric shock. But be it more or less, it was derived from English Laws, and by no means to be compared to the severe branding in England, which was done by a large iron instrument, and when in the hand, this was placed on a block.

The English Laws went further, and branded runaways and vagabonds, &c. on the forehead, and bored the gristle of the ear through with a hot iron, and this by the laws of Queen Elizabeth, whose laws for the poor are now in existence.

In regard to degradation, by the laws of Charles II. and succeeding Sovereigns, all receiving charity wore badges. In short, all punishments or acts which are established for the Government of the commonalty in Jamaica, are adopted from England."

So! the Laws and Regulations of Society in Jamaica, are exactly conformable to those of England, in "THE GOLDEN DAYS OF GOOD QUEEN BESS!!"

mates of the gaols of Jamaica! Nor is this all. When picking out his marked Creoles, he forgot to pick out the following name,—*John*, a Creole, "marked W ↄ on *his shoulders*, and who says, he absconded from his master *in Carthagena*."

This is one Creole crime, at any rate, of which Jamaica is innocent; therefore, I presume the correct and charitable *Anglus* did not see it. But I will not stop here, I will come closer to the point, and grapple more strongly with him, "his friends and admirers." In his thundering speech, May 15th, Mr. Buxton, as his speech is reported in some Newspapers, upon *some* authority, said, "I have been told by a gentleman that he found *upwards* of five hundred cases of *this kind* in a *single* Newspaper in a single *Island!*" There is nothing like making a good story when a person is about it. I should like to see that *Gazette* and (stand forward, *Anglus*, thou who knowest all bad things) that Gentleman. With such assertions it is difficult to grapple. They slip through our fingers like *ten-feet eels*, VIGOROUS as Mr. Buxton, and SLIPPERY as Mr. Macaulay; but when they come to names and places, and dates, then we can catch them, slippery as they are. During the same debate, Mr. Buxton told a sad tale about a man named Peter, a Mungola negro, who, in Jamaica, was marked "with a crow-iron" with the letters "A. C. S. E. R. O. N. V. J. L. L. E. *all on his breast.*" In the *Jamaica Royal Gazette*, May 22d last, and which must be allowed to be authority equally strong on my side as *Anglus* makes it on his, the former master of this slave, a respectable Frenchman, states, that he fled from St. Domingo when the British evacuated the island, and declares, that this said Peter had once been his slave, that Peter had been repeatedly marked, on account of his bad conduct—"RUNNING away from time to time, and STEALING as occasion presented itself;" and that the operation was performed by a surgeon, "*with a pen dipped in aquafortis*," not a hot iron: Peter, says the honest and indignant Frenchman, never dreams that the Representatives of the people of Great Britain would be occupying their time with "the name of a ROGUE AND A VAGABOND, who, had he resided in England, would have long since *been hanged.*" The Frenchman is mistaken—Peter knows better. To get the

name and the cause of a prostitute; a thief, or a traitor, particularly if their guilt is clear, is the greatest possible treat to several British Patriots and Representatives.

Perusing this plain and incontrovertible statement, I would ask, my Lord, to whom the charge of "*incorrectness*" applies, or if there is one single feature of the original charge, or answer, preserved, or noticed or supported in the statement brought against me by *Anglus?* NO!

The charge "of *exaggeration, incorrectness, misrepresentation and misstatement,*" therefore, my Lord, lies, and lies heavy at the door of my opponent, not at mine. There is no direct falsehood so dangerous as a fact distorted, exaggerated and misrepresented, or as the suppression of truth. I charge *Anglus* with the whole of these in this very matter, and there I leave him with—the *brand* "on his BREAST," stamped by the types of the *Glasgow Courier*, which types yet hope to impress the dispersion and overthrow of an Anticolonial, and shame to tell, British Anticolonial Confederacy!

In France, my Lord, criminals are very generally branded. In this country the crime of manslaughter is punished by branding deeply the culprit with a hot iron. In the navy, I have heard, it is common to brand deserters with the letter D.; and, now my Lord, I call upon, and have a right to call upon *Anglus* to point me out one Creole slave, *not a criminal*, who is branded, and also wherein any slave, since the abolition of foreign importation, has been branded *with public approval and approbation.*

But, my Lord, I shall be told, that in France and in Britain, the individuals branded are branded according to law, and by the order of the civil Magistrate. On this I observe that, when this country established slavery by law, then the law constituted in the Colonies, as it constituted in every other country, where such a state of society existed, and especially in Israel, under laws enacted by command of the MOST HIGH; the master, a *magistrate*, and the awarder of punishment for offences committed by his slaves.

I am, &c.

JAMES MACQUEEN.

Glasgow, 15*th October*, 1824.

COLONIAL CONTROVERSY.

Nos. VI.—VII.—VIII.

ANGLUS' MISREPRESENTATIONS—REFUTED.

To the Right Honourable the Earl of Liverpool.

My Lord,

Seeing that *Anglus* mixes up the matter in my work on Colonial subjects, with my observations in the Glasgow Courier, upon their Anticolonial circulars, as these were poured upon the public, I am compelled to take up the defence of both. In a description of the abandoned character of the whites in Jamaica, *Anglus*, *(New Times,)* Sept. 28th, Letter No. 6, accuses me of ascribing words used by Mr. Stewart, as the words of "the shameless writer" of the "Substance of the Debate" upon Mr. Buxton's motion. I did so. I still do so. I will state my reason.

To place this matter right, my Lord, we must go back to the outset. In the work entitled, "Negro Slavery, &c." and in the work alluded to, the charge made against the West Indies, and against Jamaica in particular, was, that the universal depravity of manners was such, that the married white man, who kept his coloured mistress before his wife's face, was held to have committed no moral offence or indecency, and was equally respected as the most virtuous individual in the community. My answer to this foul calumny was, that the statement was untrue, and that wherever any man so far forgot or violated his moral duties, he was universally despised. Has *Anglus* shewn, that what I stated is not the fact? NO! The words in "Negro Slavery delineated, &c." page 87, the author of which, some say, is Mr. Macaulay, but others, Mr. Stephen, are:

"The most unrestrained licentiousness prevails, almost universally, on Estates, amongst ALL CLASSES, whether white or black. The face of society presents, with few exceptions, ONE UNVARYING SCENE of open and promiscuous concubinage and prostitution!"

These surely are his words. He will not deny them, and to prove these, Mr. Stewart is quoted by him. The author who does this, makes the words of whatever author he quotes on the subject, his words, and his views, and his meaning, but he does so to all intents and purposes, when, as in this case he SUPPRESSES WHOLE PASSAGES to suit his views. That he has done this, I shall proceed to shew.

Mr. Stewart's words are,

" Even if slavery and its attendant abuses did not exist here, no great improvement in the state of society could be expected, while the most gross and open licentiousness continues, as at present, to prevail amongst all ranks of the whites. The males of course are here exclusively meant; *for as to the white females, it must be said to their honour that they are in general* UNEXCEPTIONABLY CORRECT *in their conduct; so particular are they in this point of character, that the white female who misconducts herself, falls instantly from* GRADE *in society,* BELOW *even that of women of colour, in whose vocabulary of virtue, chastity is unknown.* Every unmarried white man, and of every class, has his black or his brown mistress, with whom he lives openly; and of so little consequence is this thought, that his white female friends and relations think it no breach of decorum to visit his house, partake of his hospitality, fondle his children, and converse with his housekeeper. But the most striking proof of that low estimate of moral and religious obligation here, is the fact, that the man who lives in open adultery, that is, who keeps his brown or black mistress, in the very face of his wife and family, and of the community, has generally as much outward respect shewn him, and is as much countenanced, visited and received in company, especially if he be a man of some influence and weight in the community, as if he had been guilty of no breach of decency, or dereliction of moral duty. This profligacy is, however, less common than it was formerly. IN NO COUNTRY, *however, are examples of female infidelity more rare than in Jamaica. The wedded fair with whatever lack of patience she bears the insults of an unfaithful partner, has too lively a sense of the enormity of his crime, to resent it by retaliation,*" (p. 173–174.)

As quoted by the writer alluded to.

" Even if slavery and its attendant abuses did not exist here, no great improvement in the state of society could be expected, while the most gross and open licentiousness continues, as at present, to prevail amongst all ranks of the whites. The males of course are here exclusively meant. Every unmarried white man, and of every class, has his black or his brown mistress, with whom he lives openly; and of so little consequence is this thought, that his white female friends and relations think it no breach of decorum to visit his house, partake of his hospitality, fondle his children, and converse with his housekeeper. But the most striking proof of that low estimate of moral and religious obligation here, is the fact, that the man who lives in open adultery, that is, who keeps his brown or black mistress, in the very face of his wife and family, and of the community, has generally as much outward respect shewn him, and is as much countenanced, visited and received in company, especially if he be a man of some influence and weight in the community, as if he had been guilty of no breach of decency, or dereliction of moral duty. This profligacy is, however, less common than it was formerly.

This reference correctly given, places matters before us in a different light. When Mr. Stewart, or any other man, asserts, or publishes, that which is morally impossible, his testimony ceases to be authority, and the writer, who publishes his statement *partially* to the world, and without that *test* which can only enable us to decide upon its authenticity—that writer, I say, makes the words of such authority his own words. This, "the shameless writer," defended by *Anglus*, has done. My Lord, it is utterly impossible that in any country upon earth, all the male population can be so hideously immoral, as Mr. Stewart, and "the writer" so often alluded to, sets the people in Jamaica down to be, and still all the females of any class remain without stain or reproach. That the white females in our Colonies are so, is universally allowed, and cannot be denied.

With justice, therefore, my Lord, did I quote the words *extracted* from Mr. Stewart, as the words and real views and decision of the "shameless writer," which epithet besides was applied not for that alone, but for numerous exaggerations and misstatements contained in the same publication, and the Nottingham case among the rest. I call him therefore again, not merely "a shameless writer," but *a dishonest* writer; nor do I stop here; I call him an *anti-Christian* writer; and as he is so fond of appealing to his Bible, I call upon him to point out to me the passage which authorizes him to seek out only what can blacken, and suppress whatever can take away reproach from his neighbour's character, while I can refer him to every chapter in that Book, to shew that his conduct ought to be the reverse.

A great deal, my Lord, has been said about West India vices and immorality. I do not mean to deny that there are vices and immorality there, or to defend such as prevail there, but I will ask, are there any crimes committed in the West Indies, which are unknown in every other country of this Globe? And are there not numerous and heinous crimes perpetrated in other countries, which are there unknown? Nor is this all, my Lord, I assert, and call upon *Anglus*, from any credible authority, to shew the contrary, that in no other country, within the Tropics, from the rising to the setting sun, are there

fewer vices, greater industry, and higher degrees of civilization and knowledge, than are to be found in our West India Colonies, amongst society in general. Let declamation be dropt, calm research and facts appealed to, and let any one country, or every country, situate, as I have said, within (I might add, and some without) the Torrid zone, be placed side by side with our Colonies, and the latter need not fear, nor shrink from the comparison.

Anglus says, *New Times*, Sept. 18th, Letter No. 4. "Suppose a Frenchman or an American were to *profess to give a view to the world* of the condition of the English labourer, and in the execution of his purpose were to QUOTE ONLY that part of our Statute Book, which consigns vagrants to the workhouse, or which CARTS PAUPERS home to their own parishes, or which FIXES THE HOURS of manufacturing labour—and then were to exclaim—such is the boasted freedom of the English peasant, A FREEDOM NOT VERY FAR REMOVED FROM THE CHARACTER OF SLAVERY, would not the whole ire of the *Quarterly Review* be poured out against such a man? His vocabulary, such as it is, would scarcely supply terms of vituperation strong enough to designate the COMBINED IGNORANCE AND UNFAIRNESS of such a description."

Indeed, my Lord, no terms of reproach could be found in the English tongue sufficiently strong to mark the baseness of such a man, as it required. But suppose, my Lord, that such a man—"a Frenchman or an American," should, after having acted as *Anglus* describes, proceed a step further—suppose he should bring forward the punishment of the hulks, the prostitution of the most degraded of the public stews of vice in the great metropolis, the private vices of the most corrupted private individual, and the cruel scenes of dissipation, sorrow, misery, distress and despair, which may be hourly witnessed in our streets, and heard of in our Police Offices, and having accumulated all these together into one dark scroll, then publish them to the world, as an *accurate*, and *just* account of the state, condition and character of the whole British population—what should we call "a Frenchman or an American," who could so far prostitute or violate truth?

I request *Anglus* to answer my question. He and his as-

sociates have, on every occasion, and in every thing, pursued such a course against our West India Colonies, and, therefore, to use "his own vocabulary, *such as it is*," the English tongue "would scarcely supply terms of vituperation, strong enough to designate the combined ignorance and unfairness of such a description."

The miserable reference to prove misrepresentation in the following statement taken from their general manifesto, scarcely deserves notice—but to shew their sophistry, I stated,

"Next we are told, that the Negroes are driven to their work and compelled to labour under the lash on Sunday, in order to procure maintenance for themselves."

It is utterly impossible, my Lord, within the bounds of a newspaper or a book, to insert the numerous anticolonial volumes and pamphlets, but my practice is, where these are found in separate parts and in different works, and extend to great length, to condense the matter, meaning, and *evident drift* of the whole. This I did with the one in question, as *Anglus* must have seen, because it was not as other references were, inserted within *inverted commas*. What is contained in their reference and quotation, is not all they write on that subject. No! In the same sheet from which it is taken, and in the paragraph but one preceding it, the same manifesto ("Substance Debate," page 14.) states:—

"The slaves, whether male or female, are driven to labour by the impulse of the cart whip, for the sole benefit of their owners, from whom they receive no wages; and this labour is continued (with certain intermissions for breakfast and dinner) from morning to night, THROUGHOUT THE YEAR."

Part of their statement, which *Anglus* only thinks proper to quote, runs thus:

"Besides being generally made to work under the lash, WITHOUT WAGES, the Slaves are FURTHER OBLIGED to labour for their own maintenance on that day which ought to be devoted to repose and religious instruction."

In the same sheets also, and in the heads of Mr. Buxton's plan to bring before Parliament, I find one head runs "to abolish COMPULSORY labour on the Sunday."

What the writers of the passages quoted, intended to be understood by them, is not so much the object, as what multitudes understand by them; and I know and hear, it is, that the Slaves are compelled by the lash to work for themselves on Sunday. Such an impression and belief I also believe the writers intended should arise from the perusal of them. The misrepresentation on this head lies with the authors of the paragraphs in question. The slaves are not OBLIGED to labour to procure maintenance for themselves on Sunday, because they have sufficient maintenance given to them, or time allowed them on week days to procure it. They do not indeed receive wages for their labour, but they receive what is better, and what wages cannot always procure—namely, food, clothing, lodging, land (without rent) to cultivate, time to cultivate it, attendance when sick, support in old age and infirmity, and they pay no taxes. Can *Anglus* deny these truths? And why are they concealed? For a dishonest purpose certainly. This conclusion is irresistible.

During the autumn of last year, an anticolonial champion inserted some letters in the *Glasgow Courier*, in one of which, it was, in substance, stated, that the individual who had lived long—the longest in the West Indies, and in the highest rank of society, acquired, from the contamination of the place, such demoralized habits as rendered him totally unfit to associate with "well-ordered families and virtuous society" in this country. In reply to this false assumption, I adduced as an instance Mr. Stephen himself, who had lived long in St. Kitts, and had owned an estate and slaves, which he sold, and yet he was admitted into, and married into the best regulated society in this country. This was my statement, and such was the object of it. It seems, however, that Mr. Stephen never had an estate and slaves, but Mr. Macaulay must know well that such a statement was not fabricated by me. The fact was generally credited, both in the West Indies and in this country, even by gentlemen here, whose law agent and correspondent Mr. Stephen was for many years. And knowing, as I did know, for a positive fact, that Mr. Stephen's brother had an estate and Slaves, I the more readily conceived the general rumour to be true, that Mr. Stephen had owned an estate also. But to accuse Mr. Stephen of any thing wicked or immoral on that

account, never once entered my mind, nor was ever expressed by any idea however distant. As I never feel ashamed to acknowledge error when I have committed it, I credited the denial which Mr. Stephen put forth, and stated that if I had done him *injustice* on the point mentioned, I should be the first to render him *justice*. Resolved, however, (I had never been in St. Kitts myself) to be no longer deceived by reports, however general and strong, I addressed a letter to a most respectable Gentleman in St. Kitts, requesting *correct* information on these points. Some time ago I received an answer from him to the following effect.

St. Kitts, June 9th, 1824.

"I have a clear recollection of Mr. Stephen, while he was a practising Barrister in our Courts here, although I was young at the time. In justice to him, I am bound to say, that his character, while residing here, is without a blemish, from all that I have been able to learn of it, and I have had better opportunities of acquiring a knowledge of his character while here, than most men, for he was the most intimate friend and associate of my father, although I can myself speak of little more than a personal acquaintance with him. Mr. Stephen *did own one or two of the domestics* that attended him, but he manumitted them before he quitted the Island. He never did own an estate, although he was possessed of a small lot of land in town, and which he sold previous to his departure. His brother William, who is long since dead, held a second mortgage on an estate in this Island, called Samosalls. The mortgage was afterwards assigned to Messrs. Brickwood and Daniel, of London. Mr. John Stephen quitted this Island about the middle of last year. This Gentleman owned an estate and slaves in the Island of Trinidad,* and another in the Island of Tortola, but he has sold both, I know not, however, to whom. I understand he has obtained an appointment as Solicitor General in New South Wales."

The name of the gentleman who writes the above, is ready to be produced to Mr. Stephen, should he ever think of requiring it. I have nothing to hide, and nothing to fear in any Colonial contest. With these remarks, I proceed to lay before your Lordship and the public, the article which appeared in the *Glasgow Courier* of October 30th last year, concerning Mr. Stephen, written for the object mentioned; and at the same time to transcribe and contrast it with the article regarding it put forward by *Anglus*, in Letter No. 5. *New Times*, Sept. 23d.

* The estate was, I believe, sold to a gentleman of this city, now no more, and if I was inclined to follow out the subject, I could shew to *whom* and for *what* the price was paid *in* London.

Glasgow Courier, Oct. 30th.

"Why what foolery is all this about banishing Colonists from *virtuous society* here, as if the term was unknown in these possessions, and the society there. Mr. Stephen himself, the scribe, tongue, and trump of the African Institution, if not a native of, resided long in St. Kitts, was the owner of an Estate and slaves there, which he sold and pocketed, as he was entitled to do, the price; and yet we find that by marriage he became brother to Mr. Wilberforce himself."

By Anglus, Sept. 23d.

"A malignant fabrication which was first communicated through the medium of his newspaper—namely, that Mr. Stephen had been the proprietor of a plantation and slaves in the West Indies, which, on quitting that part of the world, he had sold to a purchaser, *whom, without returning the purchase money, he was now endeavouring fraudulently to strip of his property, by promoting the emancipation of slaves.* I need not say that Mr. Stephen was never the owner of a plantation, *or even of a single slave in the West Indies.*"

Let the above statements be compared and contrasted, and then let it be said on which side "malignant fabrication" rests. The charge here distinctly launched from the hand of *Anglus*, is in its most material parts as bitter and as unfounded a fabrication as ever was penned. I leave the man, my Lord, who could so deliberately ascribe to me words and sentiments, which he knew I never wrote, to that reprobation which the minds of "reasoning people in this country" will supply, but which language is too feeble to express.*

* While this sheet was in the press, the pamphlet just published by *Anglus* came into my hands. On the subject mentioned, *Anglus*, in a note, p. 44, says, "Mr. Macqueen has very manfully retracted much of what he said against Mr. Stephen on former occasions. His information is still incorrect. The correspondent on whom he relies, still makes Mr. Stephen to have been the owner of *several* domestic slaves. This, however, is altogether untrue, and the undoubted fact is, that Mr. Stephen never was the owner of a *single slave.*" Wherever, or whenever I learn that I have been led into error regarding Mr. Stephen, or any other person, I shall always be found ready to acknowledge that error. I quote the words, however, to show the multiplying powers of anticolonial language. My informant says that Mr. Stephen had "two domestic slaves," whom he liberated. *Anglus* makes him say he had "*several.*"! This is part of their tactique; but they never retract—never acknowledge error! And "in the same spirit, and with the same truth," does Anglus, by his assertion, try to invalidate the statements made in "the Glasgow Courier and other Journals," that inflammatory publications were circulated in the Colonies, sent out by emancipators in this country. Who they were I know not, or should not be slow to tell. The *Glasgow Courier* quoted its authority for saying so. The bare contradiction of *Anglus* will not make me disbelieve it. But deadly hostile as *Anglus* is to our Colonies, I certainly never

MEABRY and Cooper, I dismiss with the contempt they merit, merely observing, that the bare denial of facts by Mr. Cooper—the man who denies "the HOLY NAME by which we are called," and who "accounts the BLOOD of the covenant an unholy thing"—that the bare denial, by such a man, of facts sworn to by others; and the bare denial of Mr. Meabry, the boy of 18, who carried, as is sworn to, a *venereal* disease from London, to preach morality for the space of 18 days, to the people of Jamaica, and then came home to tell us about their moral and political condition, will not satisfy me, though it may satisfy *Anglus*. Indeed, I ought to apologize to your Lordship, for venturing to bring such characters under review.

I notice the wretched *push* made by Anglus, with Mr. Middleton, Jamaica, merely because it forms the introduction to a much more important subject. I gave my authority for stating, that the body called the African Institution, though formerly known by another name, wished to get Mr. Middleton, to give them "useful information," in a word, to act as a spy—I gave that authority, namely, the *Jamaica Royal Gazette*, and when I stated, that "THE AUTHOR had the information from Mr. Middleton himself," I clearly and distinctly pointed out, that the reference was the communication of a Correspondent, not an Editorial article. It is perfectly absurd to hear an anonymous writer, as *Anglus* is, objecting to the authority of another man who writes under a feigned name, and still more so in this case, when it is known that *Quercus* has been quoted by anticolonists, as good authority. *(See "Substance Debate, &c." page 228, where two pages are occupied in arguing against him.)* The quibble employed to invalidate the truth, namely, that the African Institution began in 1807, while this statement of Mr. Middleton's, is represented as having been made in 1800, is extremely silly and ridiculous, but worthy the cause and the pen which makes it. It is true, the present African Institution

for a moment supposed that he could be guilty of acts so frantic and dangerous. Probably also *Anglus* would call these proper and harmless publications, that I would call criminal and dangerous.

(I mean as to its active, guiding, writing, and leading members) began in 1807, but it is equally true, that some men were associated in a body, with objects similar to what the present Institution have in view, many years before the year 1800. Nothing can be more reasonable, than to suppose that *Quercus*, writing in 1823, would use the name by which the Associated Company was at present known, namely, the African Institution. *Anglus* must be hard run, when reduced to the necessity of quibbling upon a point like this, so weak and so untenable.

Anglus says, the statement that Mr. Middleton was expected to act the part of a spy, "is a malignant fabrication." It may be so, but I am not the fabricator. But "*Anglus*" does not stop here. He asks, with a sneer, "how has it happened that none of the spies have been detected in the exercise of their VILE CALLING, except this solitary renegado, Mr. Middleton," and adds, "I challenge him," the present writer, "and the whole body of his friends and admirers, to prove one tittle of all they have so hardily asserted on this subject."

This is a bold and confident challenge. I fearlessly accept it, and proceed to the proof of what I stated, and what *Anglus* and his friends deny.

The fact of the employment of spies, they have enabled me to state in a very clear and very satisfactory manner, namely, by publicly issuing an advertisement, requiring individuals thus to "exercise their vile calling," and which, at the same time informs us, that previous to that date, they had spies actually employed in the Colonies. In vol. 15th, p. 501, of the "Edinburgh Review," it is thus printed and published by authority, "It would be highly impolitic in the BOARD, *(African Institution)* to disclose in a public report, their information on this subject. We shall continue the same SILENCE, and such of our readers as have the means of giving information which may assist in eliciting the practices in question, are REQUESTED to transmit their COLONIAL INFORMATION, *without delay*, either to the publishers of the Review, or to the INSTITUTION in London. The address of the Secretary, Mr. MACAULAY, is Birchin Lane, London!" Nor does the Review stop here. In vol. 19th, the Critic says, "OTHERS, as well as the CHIEFS of

the civil and military departments, should BE ENCOURAGED to correspond."*

But I adduce farther and more incontrovertible authority. In the pamphlet entitled, "*Reasons for a Registry*," written, as is well known, by Mr. Stephen, the spy system is most openly avowed. "LETTERS AND PERSONAL communications from Gentlemen of respectability, to the Secretary and General Committee of the African Institution, would suffice to remove all doubt of the existence of such offences, to some extent, at least, if it were not a *necessary precaution* with that Body, to CONCEAL the names of individuals RESIDENT IN, or CONNECTED WITH, the WEST INDIES, who SEND them, from humane motives, *useful information*. The transmission of it, might otherwise dangerously expose the authors to popular odium or private resentment in that country."†

They must be very stupid, indeed, my Lord, who misunderstand the meaning of such passages, and very forgetful and very impudent too, who will deny that the African Institution

* It cannot be here deemed irrelevant to supply the character of an informer, as drawn by the pen of their greatest hero, in his attack upon the *Society for the Suppression of Vice*:—

"An informer is generally a man of indifferent character. So much FRAUD and DECEPTION are necessary for carrying on his trade, it is so odious to his fellow-subjects, that NO MAN OF RESPECTABILITY will undertake it. It is evidently impossible to make such a character otherwise than *odious*." (Edin. Rev. vol. 13th. p. 334.)

† To judge of the danger to be apprehended from such an assemblage, we have only to attend to the power and the privileges which they claim.

They are (see Special Report, p. 138) a Body "who, not having ever received, nor even solicited either powers or aids from the Legislature, are not, in the usual course of affairs, accountable to it. By their own constituents, the *subscribers who elect them*, they are at all times liable to be questioned, and have ever cheerfully afforded them every information." In the *Edinburgh Review*, vol. 15th, p. 497, we are very distinctly informed, that the power of regulating matters connected with the Colonies, is their privilege alone. "This service is one which a body like the African Institution is well adapted to perform—it is one which no Government can safely be intrusted with, and, least of all," Mr. Perceval's administration, of which your Lordship was a prominent member. Justly might Mr. Macaulay, therefore, call such an Institution "AN IMPORTANT ENGINE!" But I contend, my Lord, that there ought to be no power in this country, or body of men, who are not, "IN THE USUAL COURSE OF AFFAIRS, ACCOUNTABLE TO THE LEGISLATURE."

employ, had, and have spies in the West Indies. They may *dignify* or *degrade* their informants by any name they please, but still they are spies What is a spy? A man who transmits to nearer or more distant parts, intelligence which he dares not publish, and is ashamed to avow in the community where he lives.

Mr. Macaulay knows well, that not a few of those spies have been discovered. But as he affects to have forgotten, I must refresh his memory. I commence with Governor Elliot. If not one, he was certainly a near ally, and a particular favourite he was with "the Committee of the Institution." Shortly after his arrival in the West Indies, to assume the Government of the Leeward Islands, he addressed a despatch to your Lordship in 1811, wherein he denounced the inhabitants of St. Kitts, and other islands, whom he *had never seen*, as "a few managers, overseers, self-created lawyers, self-educated physicians, and adventurous merchants, with little capital and scanty credit;—to collect," said he, "from such a state of society, men fit to be legislators, judges, or jurymen, is perfectly impracticable, individual interest, personal influence, animosity of party feuds, weigh down the scale of justice, &c." This despatch, some way or other, found its way into the hands of the anticolonists, got into the public papers, and went to St. Kitts. Indignation was general. An address to your Lordship followed. With it, the justly indignant population, transmitted the address of Governor Elliot to them, when he first landed in the island, wherein he calls them "enlightened—respectable—subjects of the British empire, GLOWING WITH THE ARDENT LOVE OF THEIR COUNTRY, HEIRS OF THEIR COURAGE AND INDEPENDENT SPIRIT OF THEIR ANCESTORS," whose support and advice, and private friendship, he most anxiously solicited and coveted. With these documents, came their bold and unanswered challenge, "*we dare the proof, we defy our accusers.*" A short period saw a new Governor in the Leeward Islands.

He was a spy, my Lord, who wrote to the African Institution, from Antigua, the account inserted in their Tenth Report, that an aid-du-camp, in the suite of the late Sir James Leith, repeatedly flogged, and most barbarously treated a female slave, during her pregnancy, and that when indicted for cruelty,

the Grand Jury of the island threw out the Bill.—Sir James Leith, declared that the story "was a calumny, without the shadow of a foundation," got up by "some incorrigible dupe, or UNCONSCIONABLE KNAVE." Mr. Hatchard, the publisher of the Report, (the Institution refusing to give up the author or produce the letter) was tried, convicted, and punished, for what the British Judge termed, "a wicked calumny"—which had "*originated in wilful and wicked fabrication.*" Whatever *Anglus* may say, I assert that the correspondent in this case was a spy, and a spy of the worst description.

"The Rev. Mr. Wray and others," were spies, when they wrote and transmitted to Mr. Macaulay, "Secretary of the Crown Estates," and the soul and strength of the African Institution, "a document, said to contain a representation of the present (1817) state of Berbice." Of this document, Governor H. W. Bentinck, in his despatch to Earl Bathurst, dated, Berbice, May 26th, 1817, says, "I need not dwell on the temper and colour of this document of Messrs. Wray and others, MANUFACTURED, as it will appear, IN ENGLAND; as your Lordship will, I am assured, do me the justice to believe, that had I been duly informed of any irregularities, I should have exerted my power to prevent their recurrence; but if Mr. Wray will confide all these to his own knowledge, and VENT his imagination SECRETLY to Messrs. MACAULAY and Walker; or as it would appear, give imperfect accounts to the Fiscal, with earnest request to *indulge* the offenders, ****, &c. &c." *Anglus* may produce me any thing, in any spy system, to match this if he can.

When Colonel Arthur, late superintendent in Honduras, after three years residence there, wrote the Noble Secretary of State for the Colonies, that the slaves in that settlement, were the happiest peasantry in the world, and, three years afterwards, after having, by deceitful conduct, as they assert, lulled the free population into a state of security, when he secretly wrote to the Colonial office, directly the reverse, he was certainly acting the part of a spy; and whether or not he communicated direct with the Secretary of the Institution or Society, or whatever name they may assume, I cannot say, but this much is certain, that the scribes of these bodies, had pos-

session of all his underhand despatches, earlier than any one else.

He was a spy, who informed Mr. Buxton about Peter, the Mungola negro, being branded, without informing him, that Peter was a rogue and a vagabond, and his former master, a Frenchman, who had fled from St. Domingo, to avoid the horrors of negro anarchy, and "African sovereignty."

He was a spy, my Lord, who transmitted to some one in this country, the story told by Mr. Buxton, about the rebel leader, Billy, Demerara, who became so, because he was separated from his wife and family, and advertised to be sold on the 27th August, nine days subsequent to the commencement of the revolt, not one syllable of which was true. He was a spy, who transmitted to this country, an account, that Dr. Chapman attended the execution of the negro leader, SANDY, to prevent the white colonists extorting a confession from him to suit their purposes, but every syllable of which account, Dr. Chapman asserts to be false. He was a spy, my Lord, who transmitted to this country, the statement, that the revolt in Demerara, was "*solely*" occasioned by the Governor, and the authorities suppressing and refusing to obey the despatches and orders of Earl Bathurst, when the fact is, that these despatches and orders, dated July 9th, did not reach Demerara, till the evening of the 19th August, the day AFTER the revolt. I might fill a volume with similar facts, but consider what I have adduced, as sufficient to prove the accuracy of what I stated, and the very gross inaccuracy of my opponent.

No doubt, my Lord, these references will be called "misstatements and misrepresentations," but I am much deceived if His Majesty's Government do not, from sad experience, find them true to the letter, and greatly misinformed, indeed, if the Executive does not, in their proceedings, feel the deplorable consequences of such rash, unconstitutional interference.

The consequences of such a system, existing without check or means of punishment, must be, that neither rank nor character can be safe from their machinations. If ministerial errors deprive Great Britain of her Colonies, the nation knows how to reach the authors of her wrongs; but the SECRET correspondents of *Anglus* and others, may fan the flame of rebellion,

and kindle the fire which may cover the whole with ashes, without any constitutional means of reaching the authors of such a fearful calamity—and who, gazing upon the scene of carnage and desolation, would tell us, with the usual anticolonial indifference, it is "for the UNIVERSAL FREEDOM OF MAN," it is "THE WORK OF GOD!"

THERE is a reasonable excuse for any writer who may be misled by information, which, though honestly given, it is still possible may turn out incorrect; but there is not the same excuse for him who misquotes words placed before his eyes, and sets down from these the sentiments of another, quite different from what the latter conveyed and intended to convey. In Letter No. 6, *New Times*, Sept. 28. *Anglus* in a foot note, says "Mr. Macqueen tells us, without adducing the slightest authority for his assertion, that the emancipation of the *Cerfs*, or *Villeins*, in Russian Poland, had produced utter ruin to master and slave, and an open revolt which it required 500,000 bayonets to keep down;" and, having adduced this as a correct quotation, Anglus proceeds to state that he had inquired and found no such results; on the contrary, says he, "in Esthonia, Livonia and Finland, the happiest results followed."

It is curious, my Lord, to hear a writer making such a statement "without adducing the slightest authority for his assertion," who had just been so severely reprimanding another writer, *not anonymous*, for making a similar statement, and in a similar manner. This I merely remark *en passant*. But, my Lord, I *never* made such a statement as *Anglus* has attributed to me. In the preface of my book so often alluded to, I stated; "some years ago the Emperor Alexander decreed the emancipation of the *villeins*, or slaves, in the Polish provinces BORDERING ON RUSSIA PROPER," but mark the consequences; the masters were ruined, the emancipated *villeins* were indolent, and without capital or property—a famine unfortunately ensued, and without protection or support, tens of thousands of these helpless beings were swept

away. Here, my Lord, I did not say one word about the Provinces of Esthonia, Livonia, and Finland—but the "Polish Provinces bordering upon Russia Proper," or the Upper Dnieper, and the Upper Duna or Dwina. The geography of *Anglus*, however, appears to be as confused as his arguments, and is exactly of a piece with his misrepresentations. The historical and geographical ignorance here displayed, is equally conspicuous. Every European (*Anglus* it would appear excepted,) knows that Livonia, Esthonia, and Finland, do not belong to "RUSSIA PROPER," and moreover, were not Polish Provinces. The fact I stated was really no secret. The proceedings of the Emperor occasioned the greatest discontent in the provinces of Russia Proper bordering upon the Polish provinces alluded to, and, as I am told, a very distinct intimation was conveyed to his ears by the nobles in those parts, warning him not to proceed farther in plans which they considered most dangerous. It is not worth my while, my Lord, to wade through the columns of the public journals of the day, to get the precise dates; but about three years ago, if *Anglus* chooses to search, he will find an account of an open revolt amongst the *villeins* in the province of Witepsk in particular, which was promptly put down by the presence of a large Russian force. At this time also it is notorious to all Europe, that in expectation of war with Turkey, Russia had concentrated in her provinces, from the Black Sea to the Niemen, and from the Duna to the frontiers of Gallicia, a force estimated at 500,000 men.

My argument and my words on this point, my Lord, which *Anglus*, with his accustomed disingenuity, has perverted, were these:—"If such were the results of sudden emancipation in Russian Poland, where 500,000 bayonets kept down open revolt, how much more dreadful will the consequences be of emancipating the slaves in our West India colonies." And will *Anglus* look this statement in the face, and, as it stands, controvert it. He and his associates confound things which are as different as light is from darkness. In Russia, the emancipation, where it takes place, is emancipation to people of the same colour, country and manners, amongst a people where freemen are already numerous,

where the Sovereign is despotic, and the military resources of the country overwhelming and irresistible, against any attempt at rebellion, or the destruction of the other class, which *villeins* or emancipated *villeins* may make or entertain. In our colonies the situation of affairs is totally different, and that which may be done suddenly and safely in Russia, it is evident to any thing but the diseased and prejudiced mind of *Anglus*, would be attended with anarchy and ruin to masters and slaves in our colonies. There the slave population is almost ten to one—the military strength comparatively feeble in point of numbers, and still more so, when climate is taken into consideration, and these too placed at a great distance from the parent state, and their resources and supplies. The colour also, and disposition of the races of men—free and slaves, are totally and radically different, and '*mix the races*' as he will, still, till he can mix light and darkness, without creating confusion, *Anglus* will never get the population to amalgamate. The destruction or banishment of the master, his capital and his credit, must be the result of emancipation, as *Anglus* would have it.

I have now, my Lord, replied to the angry and tyrannical attacks of *Anglus* so far as these are personally directed against myself, and the Journal in which I write. I call the attacks tyrannical, because they are made through columns and channels completely under his control, and wherein, without paying for it, no contradiction is allowed to appear. I shall next proceed to notice those points of the letters of *Anglus*, embracing public questions of deep and serious importance, and in which your Lordship and the public are more immediately concerned and interested. In doing this, the *crooked* ways of the leading anticolonists, will appear in still stronger and more reprehensible colours than any I have yet adduced.

I am, &c.

JAMES MACQUEEN.

Glasgow, 18*th October*, 1824.

COLONIAL CONTROVERSY.

No. IX.

ST. DOMINGO—OR HAYTI.

To the Right Honourable the Earl of Liverpool.

My Lord,

"The inhabitants of Hayti and Sierra Leone," says *Anglus*, Letter No. 6, "are already free, and in no danger of being deprived of their liberty by my misrepresentations." The question, my Lord, was not whether those places had or had not liberty, but how the latter had obtained it; what the present situation of the latter is, and what the situation of the former is contrasted with what it formerly was. *Anglus* has not dared to meddle with these statements, but shortly calls them misrepresentations. It is therefore proper that I should generally and shortly state to your Lordship, what my statements were. I take St. Domingo first, and challenge *Anglus* to contradict on any credible authority any one point I advance.

Mr. Clarkson, in a work, entitled "*Thoughts, &c.*" came forward, and trampling under foot with contempt the historical records of our own times, asserted, that there never was any insurrection of the slaves in St. Domingo, but that they gained their liberty by being at once emancipated by a Decree of the French Government, in 1794. After him followed the *Edinburgh Review*, in the same strain. In No. 77, p. 130, 131, the Critic says "the revolt and consequent massacres which desolated that fine and fruitful territory, in 1791, were occasioned by the whites and mulattoes, who engaged in a fierce war themselves, excited the slaves to take a part, and made them rise against their masters, in order to increase the fury of their own destructive strife." "When the slave became free he was quiet and industrious." But coming more boldly to the point, the

Edinburgh Antislavery Society, proceeding upon the preceding authorities, say; "WE AFFIRM that the emancipation of the Negroes in St. Domingo was productive of NO MASSACRES OR INSURRECTION WHATEVER; and that THOSE who maintain the contrary, manifest a GROSS IGNORANCE of one of the most interesting portions of modern history, or a still more blameable wish to PERVERT AND CONCEAL THE TRUTH."

In answer to Mr. Clarkson, who is the guide chosen on this occasion, I shewed, from authority no one has ever yet ventured to question, that there was a Negro revolt in St. Domingo, attended with horrors indescribable, and miseries most appalling, and unconnected with the quarrel between the mulattoes and the whites in 1790, or the delirious decree of the murderous French Convention, and the bloody Goddess of Reason in 1794. The horrors and miseries, my Lord, which subsequently spread over St. Domingo under Negro freedom and French liberty and equality, I pointed out, from official documents and authentic testimony, and, amongst others, from the declarations of His late Majesty, and despatches from his Officers to the Ministry in Britain. If these, my Lord, are "misrepresentations," why then I am in error; and I shall next, I presume, and with equal justice, be told, that it is "misrepresentation" to assert that your Lordship is at present Prime Minister of Great Britain.

It would really be an insult offered to your Lordship's understanding, to point out more fully the individuals who manifest "gross ignorance of one of the most interesting parts of modern history," and "a blameable wish to pervert and conceal truth."

But, my Lord, to dwell on this point is unnecessary. The *New Times*, the great champion of all that is anticolonial, informs us the other day, (Oct. 14,) that there was a bloody and destructive Negro revolt in St. Domingo, and *Anglus* himself, that great distorter of truth, in his Letter, (*New Times*, Sept. 14,) sets the matter at rest, when he announces that St. Domingo cannot be what it was before the Revolution, because "the number of adults fit for labour is unquestionably reduced in a VERY GREAT PROPORTION;"—that adverse circumstances in which it is placed prevent its improvement, viz. "the DESTRUC-

TION of the sugar-works—the want of capital to rebuild them, THE CHILLING SENSE OF THE INSECURITY OF PROPERTY, under which it would be utterly vain to expect that man would toil for its accumulation!!"

My Lord, I might fill pages with the horrid details of the insurrection in St. Domingo—"*the destruction of the sugar-works,*" and the fatal consequences of it—"THE CHILLING SENSE of the insecurity of property;" but though I might make the narrative longer, I could not well make it stronger or richer in facts than what *Anglus* has himself made it (*inadvertently* perhaps) in these few words.

Having satisfactorily disposed of one point of the charge of misrepresentation, I proceed to other points equally important and equally easy to be cleared up; I shall take the produce and population of St. Domingo, as these stood previous to 1791, and as these stand at present, and contrast them, premising that the former account is drawn from the official return, presented by the Government of St. Domingo to the Legislative Assembly of France in 1791, and the latter from the official return of M. INGINAC for 1822, as transmitted to *Anglus* himself.

PRODUCE ST. DOMINGO.

	1790.	1822.
Sugar,* Clayed, turned into *Brown*, lbs. British	128,938,062	
Sugar,* Brown, do. do.	100,631,712	680,744
Coffee, French, do.	68,151,180	35,117,834
Cotton, do.	6,286,126	891,950
Indigo, do.	930,016	.....
Cocoa, do.	150,000	322,145
Tortoise Shell, do.	5,000	.....
Campeachy Wood, &c. lbs.	1,500,000	3,836,683
Casks Molasses, ...	29,502	.....
Puncheons Taffia, ...	303	.....
Tanned hides, ...	5,186	.....
Untanned do.	7,887	.....
Value in Colony, ...	£5,000,000	Dolls. 9,030,397
Sold in France for	£8,000,000	

Such, my Lord, is the contrast in the production of the soil of St. Domingo at these two periods. It is here necessary,

* I have stated the amount in English lbs. Muscovado, to give a clearer view of the subject. The quantity in the St. Domingo return stood thus, viz.—Clayed Sugar, 70,227,703 lbs.—Muscovado, 93,177,512 lbs. The French lb. is to the English lb. as 100 to 108.

also, to observe, that the valuation of the produce in 1791 is exclusive of all duties and charges, while the valuation for 1822 includes the high duties.

The boasts, my Lord, of the financial prosperity of Hayti, were they even true, are an insult "to reasoning people in this country." Half its revenue, according to the financial statement, is derived from heavy taxes imposed upon their agricultural produce when exported, and which half is, moreover, paid by foreigners. The price of logwood is six dollars per 1000 lbs. duty 7 dollars. The price of cotton is 12 dollars, exclusive of 2 dollars and 40 cents. duty. The price of coffee, the chief produce, is 8 dollars per 100 lbs. Export duty, 21 dollars, paid by exporters, and a territorial duty of 16 dollars per 1000 lbs. paid by proprietors!! Were your Lordship and your colleagues to tax the produce of British industry at exportation, to such an extent, there would be an end to our trade. Only barbarous nations have recourse to such injudicious and oppressive measures. It is scarcely necessary to observe, that this enormous sum is taken out of the pockets—wrung from the "blood, bones and sinews" of the people who dare not complain. The Haytian Government may have no debt to foreigners or to natives—the reason is obvious. No one will trust it—and therefore—it must take by force what the Government

The return here quoted I received from a Gentleman who copied it from the official return in St. Domingo in 1791. But I have reason to believe it is the return of crop in 1790, though I never again saw him to ascertain that point. The *Edinburgh Gazetteer*, a work of accuracy and research, gives the crop of French St. Domingo, for 1791, as under, viz.:—

217,463	Casks Sugar,	84,617,328	Lbs. Coffee,
5,636	Do. Molasses,	11,317,226	Do. Cotton,
380	Do. Gums, &c.	3,257,610	Do. Indigo,
248	Boxes Aloes,	1,536,017	Do. Cocoa,
27,312	Barrels Syrop,	4,618	Bags Pepper,
1,514	Seroons Cochineal,	2,426,	Do. Ginger,
6,814	Tons Logwood, &c.	6,948	Tanned Hides,
1,865	Do. Mahogany,	114,639	Hides in hair,
4,167	Lbs. Tortoise Shell,	2,617,650	Spanish Dollars,
1,346	Boxes Sweatmeats,	57,213	Oz. Gold in grs. &c.
1,478	Seroons Jesuits Bark,		

A return almost incredible, and probably little short of seven millions sterling at the port of export!

requires, *what the Government pleases.* Before the Revolution, when the population was double, and the produce tenfold; the taxation upon the exports was only 7,000,000 livres (Col.) 580,000 dollars—2 per cent. Now it is 1,365,402 dollars, on an average, even by their estimation, or almost 20 per cent. and upon the real valuation from 50 to 100 per cent.—independent of the enormous taxation upon imports, which previous to the Revolution was almost unknown. Then the imports from the Mother Country exceeded four millions, and from other quarters two millions sterling more. Such again, my Lord, are the effects of precipitate changes amongst a barbarous people. These are facts. Can *Anglus* deny them?

With regard to the nature of the trade, and the high price of produce in Hayti, we have only to examine the prices there, and the prices of the same articles in Europe, to establish the fact of the latter, and prove the unprofitable nature of the former. Thus Coffee, which costs in Hayti 12½ dolls. to 13 dolls. per cwt. (about 62/.) stands on an average in our prices Current, 63/, leaving scarcely any thing, I may say nothing, for freight and charges. *Anglus*, my Lord, can scarcely fail to know, that the merchant does not calculate by the price of the article in Hayti, but by the price he obtains for it in the European market.

We can, my Lord, calculate the value of the produce of Hayti, that is its value in Hayti, without the assistance of *Anglus* or *Inginac.* Looking at our mercantile invoices, it is as under:—

	Gross Price.	Duties.
35,117,834 lbs. Coffee, a 12 dolls. per 100 lbs.	4,214,136	1,404,712
891,950 lbs. Cotton, a 14½ dolls. do.	127,433	20,077
652,541 lbs. Sugar, a 10 do. do.	65,250	
312,145 Cocoa, a 10 do.	31,652	5,884
3,836,633 lbs. Logwood, &c. 6 dolls. per 1000 lbs. duty 7 dolls.	49,868	26,852
Total,.....	4,488,339	1,457,525
Deduct Duties,	1,457,525	
Remains to cultivator, dolls.	3,030,814	

If we look at our own Prices Current, we will find, taking into account shipping charges, and freights and charges at the market, that the above value is correct. Indeed, the prices

and duties have been furnished me by a most intelligent merchant, lately from, and long resident in Hayti, and as the question in hand is the value of the produce of Hayti now, contrasted with what that was before the Revolution, the comparison would neither be just nor complete, unless we took the present value, exclusive of the duties, as was done before the Revolution.

SHIPS AND TONNAGE.

	1783.			1822.	
	Ships.	Tons.		Ships.	Tons.
Trade France,	580	189,674		80	13,232
Do. Great Britain,	—	———		100	14,618
Do. American,	563	55,645		695	68,695
Do. Spanish,	259	15,417		22	584
Do. African,	98 say	29,400	all others	40	4,561
Total,	1700	289,400		947	102,693

an extent which, even allowing the Haytian return to be correct, but which it is not, is little more than one-third of what the tonnage formerly was, and that one-third, be it recollected, all foreign vessels—Hayti has no merchant ships of her own, while formerly the shipping belonged to the State to which the Island belonged. In 1791, the tonnage was still more considerable. The number of seamen employed was 18,466.

The population of the Island next merits our attention. From the official document already referred to, it stood thus in 1791, viz.:—

Whites,	40,000
Mulattoes,	25,000
Negroes on Estates,	455,000
Do. not attached,	46,000
Total.	566,000

It is more difficult to obtain an accurate account of the present population. Three hundred thousand is the number which *Abbe de Pradt*, in his comparison between the power of England and Russia, sets down as the present population of St. Domingo, and he has no doubt done so from good means of information.

But in the view I have taken, and the comparison I have drawn, it must be remarked, that I am speaking only of the French part of St. Domingo. That part which formerly be-

longed to Spain, but which is now included in the population and produce of Hayti, remains to be added to the former account. By the last census in 1785, the population stood 158,646, on which number from 15,000 to 20,000 only were slaves. I can find no accurate account of the produce and shipping of this part of the island, but it must have been considerable, because as far back as the commencement of the last century, the exports of sugar amounted to a quantity equal to 19,000,000 lbs., and there must also have been a considerable quantity of Mahogany and other articles. In his work entitled "Crisis of the Sugar Colonies"—Mr. Stephen states, that the importance of French St. Domingo, which formerly eclipsed all the other Sugar Colonies united, "had been VASTLY INCREASED by the cession of Spanish St. Domingo to France."

The population of St. Domingo in 1791, therefore, would amount to 720,000, certainly much greater than what it is now. We have it under the hand of *Inginac*, the friend of *Anglus*, in a letter dated the 4th of January last, that since Boyer overran the Spanish part, all the inhabitants which did not like his order of things had left the country. The inhabitants of St. Domingo, says the *Abbe de Pradt*, "particularly on the Spanish side, are fast relapsing into ORIGINAL BARBARISM, and St. Domingo, *from a garden is become a desart.*" I have lately had opportunities of meeting with gentlemen newly arrived from that country, where they have resided many years as merchants, and who had travelled through what once were its most populous and best cultivated parts. They state that the country generally is thinly peopled; much of the land, formerly in coffee, and that which was formerly in sugar, being completely waste, the huts of the cultivators are thinly scattered in the woods, and in towns once the most flourishing, buildings new, but detached, were only seen rising up amidst the ruins.*

* This Black State is a favourite anticolonial weapon, and all the aid its rulers can give them, seems as readily afforded, as it is eagerly, and it would appear not very honourably, sought after. A few weeks ago, (*New Times*, 24th Nov. last,) through the usual channel of communication to that Journal, a dashing return from Mr. Secretary *Inginac*, of the military force and population of Hayti made its appearance; and which makes the latter 937,000, two hundred and seventeen thousand more than the number, at the commencement of the fatal Revolution in 1791. Were this statement correct, it is only another instance of the gross care-

The sugar cultivation from 250,000,000 lbs. is reduced to 680,000 lbs.! The coffee cultivation is diminished above one half. The indigo cultivation is entirely gone, and even cotton is dwindled away to a trifle. The tonnage employed in the trade is diminished fully two-thirds, the balance of trade, even according to *Mr. Inginac's* shewing, is greatly against them, while the balance in favour of France was, says Abbe de Pradt, £1,666,666 sterling! Such are the effects of Revolution, and crude experiments, and speculation amongst mankind, by ignorant enthusiasts. St. Domingo is, and should remain a warning to all Statesmen.

My Lord, there are no facts more undeniable than these, that the abundant exportation of the produce of the soil of a country is a proof of the industry of that country, and the industry thereof, a proof of its progress in civilization. The reverse in every age has designated barbarous and uncivilized nations, from the civilized nations of the earth.

Some sugar canes are no doubt cultivated in St. Domingo,

lessness and inaccuracy of *Anglus*, who, in his letter already quoted, tells us, that the male population are greatly reduced in numbers, compared to what they were previous to that event. Of this fact there can be little doubt. Bryan Edwards calculated the loss of negroes in the first six years of the civil war and revolt at 300,000.—Bourdon de la Oise in the French Directory, Nov. 10th, 1796, stated their number in the French part to be reduced to 130,000, and *Laborie* (see Edin. Rev. vol. 1st, p. 229,) estimated their number in 1797, at much less than one half that number in 1789. Such statements as the one alluded to, are easily accounted for, at a moment when it is the object and the interest of the Haytian Government to frighten France from attacking them, as if the French Government were not well aware of the true situation and strength of Hayti. That the above is a grossly exaggerated return, no man breathing, not even excepting *Anglus* himself, can for a moment doubt, and I have the authority of a Gentleman acquainted with Hayti, and lately from that country, to say that it is so. Like most *got up* stories, however, it contains within itself, proofs of its falsity. In 1786, the Spanish part of Hayti contained 152,000 inhabitants—in 1808, the New Times of the date just quoted, admits that the number was 128,000, whereas in the present return by *Inginac*, it is set down at 64,000! a decrease of one half in sixteen years!!—So much for the increased population of Hayti.

But taking the statement for sake of argument, as correct, my Lord, what does it prove? Why, that with a population increased thirty per cent. in thirty years, the exportable produce of the country is DECREASED nearly, if not fully, *four fifths!* thus disproving in the completest manner, all the tales of their increased and increasing industry.

but they are chiefly cut to procure the juice to make taffia, (a kind of rum,) which must be consumed in the country, as there is none mentioned in the export list. The price of labour is so high in Hayti, considering the quantity of work the labourers perform, even were the population inclined to the cultivation of sugar, that they cannot produce it to export, so as to come in competition with that from other quarters. The price in the island is 10 dollars, almost 50s. per cwt., while the price in our West India Colonies does not exceed 22s. The few Haytians, who hire themselves as agricultural labourers charge one-and-a-half dollar per week, exclusive of their victuals, which comes to be high wages. This, with the little labour they perform, renders competition with other places impracticable.

The boasts of increased cultivation in certain quarters, are idle dreams. Thus, according to General La Croix, the quantity of Sugar made in, or rather exported from the French part of Hayti, in 1801, was as follows:—

But, farther, of the manner and the reason for which these Haytian returns are *ordered* and produced, our anticolonists have lately and under their own hands afforded us a striking proof. The *Morning Chronicle*, December 1824, contained an official letter from Mr. *Inginac*, supplied by Mr. *Bowring*, one of the friends of Civil and Religious Liberty, regarding the deplorable and unprotected state of some Wesleyan Missionaries in Hayti. These excellent men amidst the blaze of Haytian freedom had been persecuted, insulted, fined, and imprisoned, because they ventured to preach the truths of the Gospel, to the ignorant and bigoted Black Papists in Hayti. This treatment and these proceedings of the Haytian Authorities, alarmed the anticolonists in Britain, for the character of *their friend and their ally*, and accordingly from Mr. Bowring's communication, it appears, that they had written to their "*Brethren*," Boyer and Inginac, remonstrating with them upon such proceedings, and warning them how much they were injuring "*the cause*," of general emancipation. To this, Inginac by command of his Master, returns the Jesuitical reply alluded to, and in which he decidedly states, that the Wesleyan Missionaries may live and breathe there if they please; but they must not attempt to instruct the Blacks, or preach against the established religion of the States, viz: Popery, as taught by a few ignorant Creole self-made Priests from South America. Such, my Lord, is Haytian Liberty! Yet these damning facts are passed over, not only without censure or remark, but positively with extenuation, by all those who raised such a terrific cry against our West India Colonies, for the conduct of a lawless mob, in one instance, in Barbadoes. The New Times does not even insert the document! Is this dealing fairly my Lord? Is this the boasted independence of the Free Press of Britain?

French Clayed, lbs.	16,540
Muscovado, lbs.	18,518,572
Syrop or Molasses, and no Taffia, lbs.	99,419

And "*Rainsford*," see *Edin. Rev.* vol. 18th, p. 60. "affirms that the Crop of 1800, was not more than *one-third less*, than the produce of the most prosperous seasons before the Revolution," but this account is certainly much exaggerated. *Citizen* DUGRAY, in a memorial to the French Government, in 1796, stated that the exports from that part of French St. Domingo, then held by the British, amounted to 20,000,000 *Livres*, in Sugar, Coffee, &c. The export of Coffee, from French St. Domingo, in 1805, was 30,000,000 lbs. which, taking the Spanish part, (then independent, or rather under the dominion of Spain) shews that the cultivation of Hayti, must have been as great then, if not greater, than it is now. At a later period, *Anglus*, and his friend, *M. Inginac*, have enabled us to determine these points of increasing cultivation, very clearly. Thus, in 1823, *M. Inginac* tells us, that the export of the two following articles, stands thus, viz:—

		Coffee.	Sugar.
1823.	English—lbs.	37,927,260	680,744
1823.	Into Great Britain, official, ...	4,975,264	
...	United States, do. ...	8,394,393	24,241
...	Continental Europe, ...	22,041,600	604,800
	Total, 1823,	35,411,257	629,041
	Decrease,	2,516,003	51,703

Such is the boasted increased cultivation of St. Domingo. Official returns and figures, my Lord, enable us to clear up things, which subtle logic endeavours, but in vain, to cloud or conceal.

Although it is scarcely worth while to dispute with *Anglus*, the accuracy of *Inginac's* returns, yet, there are one or two, it may be proper to place before your Lordship, thus:

Export Sugar to Britain, 1822, by *Inginac*, lbs.	218,297
Par. Pap. No. 252, of 1824, British return, lbs.	*Nil.*
Tonnage from Great Britain, by Inginac, lbs.	14,618
By Brit. Return, P. Pap. No. 223—1824, to all, For. W. Indies,	14,554

Similar and even more serious differences appear between the Haytian and North American returns, and also in the returns of exports and imports in value, as contrasted with official returns of other nations. Thus, *Inginac* says, they import

From the United States, value	6,641,570 dolls.
The United States say they export to Hayti, ...	2,270,607

The fact is, that the Haytian returns, include the duty and all charges, and the whole taken at an arbitrary and extravagant valuation, in order to increase the revenue. The confused and erroneous nature of the returns from Hayti, as these are made up, are most apparent from the following—

Gross Imports, dolls.	13,017,890
Do. Exports, ...	9,030,397
Balance against Hayti, ...	3,987,493

a balance for which I might allow *Anglus* to account, and to shew how it is paid, for I have never heard of any mines of gold or silver which Hayti has, or any means of procuring specie to pay for what she imports, except what the production of her soil affords. But we have another reference to enable us to ascertain their inaccuracy. Thus, in *Inginac's* return, we find the imports from Great Britain, set down at 3,661,241 dollars. The British exports by *Par. Pap.* No. 274, of 1824, are for 1822, to all the Foreign West Indies, £1,584,930, and of which, it is scarcely necessary to observe, above one-half goes to St. Thomas, Cuba, &c. while the imports, by the same return from the Foreign West Indies, are only £956,554.

The matter, my Lord, is not difficult to unriddle. The duties upon American Imports, are 12 per cent. and on British imports, 7 per cent. But the Tariff, always arbitrary, by which these duties were fixed, was drawn up many years ago, during war, when goods were at the very highest value. The consequence is, that the scale, in general, is 50 per cent. too much, so that 60 per cent. in most cases, remains to be deducted from the estimated official returns of Hayti, in order to ascertain the true value of the articles landed, when the imports of Hayti, from all parts, are reduced from 13,000,000, to about 8,000,000 dolls. The Exports and Imports, therefore, in 1791, and 1822, stand as follows:—

	Imports.	Exports.
1822, All parts, ...	£2,000,000	£2,100,000
1791, do. do.	5,000,600	6,844,000

The disingenuous course pursued by *Anglus* and his associates in all these subjects, justly leads me to question, with

much reason, whether their object is just and disinterested. Previous (a few days) to Mr. Whitmore bringing forward his motion about East India Sugar, last Session, the Haytian document made its appearance in the anticolonial Gazettes, particularly the *Morning Chronicle*, and sent there, I believe, by *Anglus* himself. There the number of pounds of coffee and sugar, &c. and feet logwood, were each set down as so many dollars in value—for example, the export of coffee, was 35,117,834 dollars, instead of 35,117,834 lbs.—The gross inaccuracies and absurdity of the return, the *Glasgow Courier* was the first to expose, by contrasting it with the British and American official returns. The *Quarterly Review*, next took up the question, and made a similar exposure, and months after, (except through an obscure weekly paper, the *Colonial Register*, in August, *since dead*) when the imposition could no longer stand, *Anglus* comes forward, and accuses the Reviewer of ignorance and design, from adverting to the document, and asserts that the editor of the *Morning Chronicle*, had, by mistake, printed *dolls.* instead of *lbs.* and *feet.* The gullability, my Lord, of John Bull, is proverbial, but he will scarcely swallow this, or believe that the editor of one of the first periodical journals in London, could be so stupid as to mistake the plain and *singular* mercantile character, for dolls. as the character for "LBS." and "*feet.*" I have no doubt he printed the document as he received it, and which leaves the heavy charge of ignorance and "DESIGN," at the door of another. Still, with this explanation, the discrepancies were exceedingly great, as we have seen, in the exports of coffee to Great Britain. But, says *Anglus*, Letter, No. 5. the Haytian return does not say exported to "Great Britain," but in "British ships," which probably went to foreign ports. Perhaps they did; and I believe, they do; but, my Lord, the document, as originally published, and, as it has again been re-published a few days ago, (*New Times*, October, 14th) corrected, says no such thing. The words of the Return, are "To GREAT BRITAIN!"

But the reprehensible disingenuity of *Anglus* and his associates, in order to make good their bad cause, does not stop here. In the Report of the Anti-slavery Society, published since the above exposures took place, at page 23d, the reporter

states:—" It is not true, that St. Domingo does not grow sugar for its own consumption. In the year 1822, (*Inginac's* return,) besides satisfying its own consumption, a *certain quantity*, indicated by the figures 652,451, was exported thence, chiefly to France. It *is not clear whether* this quantity is intended to specify pounds or hundred-weights!" Is it possible, my Lord, that, in the face of the world, a grave body of men, boasting of their superior knowledge and justice, should put forward a misrepresentation so bitter, and an error so gross? The very document to which they referred, expressly states, that the quantity of sugar exported from Hayti in 1822, to all parts, was 652,541 French lbs. 374,000 lbs. of which only were exported to France!!

There is no excuse, my Lord, for such a gross perversion of truth. But, even were it to be placed to the score of ignorance, it makes their cause and their conduct, not a whit less culpable. Had truth been their object, they would have endeavoured, before putting it forward, to ascertain whether the " certain quantity, indicated by figures," was 652,541 lbs. or, 73,074,512 lbs.! It was their bounden duty to do so. Pretty Legislators and Financiers, these Gentlemen would make, my Lord! safe hands to guide the destinies, and regulate the interests of a great commercial people! Suppose, my Lord, that your Right Honourable Colleague, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, should, in his financial measures for the year, make a similar blunder; and in his revenue calculations, take as CWTS. the duty on *each* of which was 27/., a set of figures, which, in reality, represented LBS. only, and chargeable with duty *at the preceding rate*—what would he say when he came to the House of Commons, to make up the deficiency in the revenue, or rather, what would the House say to him? What the British Administration should say to anticolonial societies, you are very unfit hands to be intrusted with the affairs of this empire, financial or commercial!

That St. Domingo does not raise sugar sufficient for its own consumption is well known, and Boyer's proclamation, quoted by the *Quarterly Review*, prohibiting the importation from foreign ports, sets that matter beyond dispute. Hayti imports a considerable quantity of refined sugar. That the cultivation of

sugar is decreasing, not increasing, we ascertain from the following references:—

	Eng. lbs.
Sugar exported from Hayti, 1822, by *Inginac*, ...	680,744
Imported into Great Britain, from Hayti, 1825, *Par. Pap.* No. 480, 1821, 30,559 cwts.	3,556,764

That the Haytian returns, as at first published in this country, were misrepresented by ignorance or design, cannot be denied, and is, in fact, admitted. Even in the corrected copy, as published in the anticolonial Gazettes, this is still visible. The exports of Campeachy wood, is set down, in "*feet.*" This is wrong. No such a mode of export computation is known in Hayti. The return is *lbs.* These woods are sold by the lb.—a certain price per 1000 lbs. Will *Anglus* deny this? There is not a merchant's clerk connected with Hayti, but could point him out the fact; yet *Anglus* boasts of his superior information, and brands others with ignorance or "*design*" in their statements, when most strictly adhering to truth.

The *gourde*, a Haytian coin, about which some discussion has arisen, is composed of base metal, intrinsically worth little more than *one shilling* of our money; but, in Hayti, it passes current for the same value as a good Spanish dollar. The law compels it. There is no contending against force. The French Convention made assignats, not worth a straw, pass for pounds, while the guillotine was in view. A more striking instance of Negro *stupidity* and indifference, or Haytian despotism, or both united, could not possibly be adduced.

With regard to Haytian liberty, my Lord, I do not envy those who enjoy it, nor wish to disturb those who live in it or *dream* of it. Liberty, however, in Hayti is an empty name. Her Government and her laws have been, and are, the purest despotism—the government of the sword. But I am far from blaming Boyer's administration for this. He cannot help it, even were he otherwise inclined. It is forced on him by the nature of the ignorant society over which he rules, and I will frankly acknowledge that the manner in which Boyer governs that country does credit to his talents and his power: still I do not covet the blessings of his sway, and still less would I recommend his Government as an example to follow, and a system to be established in our West India Colonies. But, my

Lord, when I hear Hayti brought forward as a specimen of what Negroes can do, when left to themselves, I deny the whole argument. The Government of Hayti is in no shape Negro. Boyer is not a Negro. His chief officers and leaders are not Negroes. The whole energies of the State and direction of its affairs are lodged, fortunately for the Negroes themselves, in the hands of intelligent mulattoes, educated in Europe. These men do every thing, calculate every thing, and direct and command every thing. The Negro is merely a passive instrument in their hands, and whether, from the particular construction of society there, where the mulatto colour must daily more and more amalgamate with the black, the governing colour and power in Hayti, shall preserve sufficient intelligence to rule a Negro race as freemen, time only can determine. But at present it is absurd to talk about the NEGRO State of Hayti.

In letter No. 3, *New Times*, Sept. 14th, *Anglus* exultingly says, "St. Domingo, during the last thirty years supported herself. Which of the Colonies, cultivated by slaves, can make an equal boast. Certainly NOT Jamaica, nor any other of the British Islands. They all lean continually on the Mother Country, not only for military defence, and FOR THE SUPPORT OF THEIR OWN INTERNAL GOVERNMENT, but for commercial privileges, and premiums in the shape of bounties, &c."

My Lord, the most material part of this statement is not merely a misstatement, it is a positive untruth. All the Colonies support their internal Governments out of their internal taxation, but Jamaica, in addition, pays the military force also! Will *Anglus* be bold enough to deny these truths? And if the Governments in the Colonies, or the British Government in the Colonies, could lay their hands as liberally and as despotically (which by the bye is what *Anglus* wants) upon the property of the population under their sway, as the Government of St. Domingo does, then they would find little difficulty in defraying the remainder of their expenses, for which, while the Mother Country chains them to her by a monopoly of trade, they "lean" and justly lean upon her to bear. *Anglus* had better not draw aside the veil to shew how St. Domingo has supported herself during the last

30 years. Is it on St. Domingo or on Great Britain, that that useless Colony Sierra Leone "leans" for the support of its "military defence" and its "interior Government?"

Heated and prejudiced by his subject or his interest, *Anglus* plunges out of one difficulty into a greater. He proceeds in the Letter just quoted. "The *cultivation of St. Domingo*, said General *Leclerc*, in his first official despatch, '*is in a much higher state of prosperity than could have been imagined*,' and as to the southern division of the island, where the revolution had not been attended as in the north, with the general destruction of the mills, boiling houses, and other works necessary for the manufacture of sugar, it was found in a VERY FLOURISHING CONDITION."

No date is given to this despatch, and I might retort upon Mr. Macaulay his own words, "as his statements are drawn from sources to which I have no access, I cannot help feeling some distrust of them." But where are these sugar mills and the flourishing sugar cultivation now? I call upon *Anglus* to answer the question. No revolt has burnt them since 1797, or since 1802. Yet is it not notorious that even those sugar plantations in the South, which escaped the fury of the revolution, have since been suffered to go to decay and ruin, and are in ruins at this day, under the boasted industry of Hayti and her Despotic Government. Christophe, though he tried by the terror of military execution, to compel his subjects to cultivate sugar, never could accomplish his object; and all his followers have been equally unsuccessful.

The great object which *Anglus* and his friends have in view is, to reduce all our Colonies to the same situation as St. Domingo. In the *New Times*, Sept. 10th, he proposes to take the land in our Colonies and divide it into farms of five or ten acres each, and give it to each emancipated negro, and then request them, as a particular favour, to cultivate sugar, which he is sure they would do, (witness the Nottinghams,) upon meeting a ready demand for their produce, part of which would go to pay rent to the proprietor. Why, my Lord, was not this boasted scheme tried in St. Domingo? When emancipation was proclaimed by the Regicide Commissioners of the National Convention over all St. Domingo,

did not the proprietors, or rather the governing Commissioners, attempt to get the negroes to work in this way, and for this object, in those districts where flames and massacre had not spread desolation? What was the result? Were not these unhappy proprietors stript of their all, compelled to abandon a place, where their lives and properties were no longer safe, and their plantations previously cultivated like a garden, left to run into wildernesses by the indolent negro? The scheme which *Anglus* has in view, is a purely Haytian one. It is the present situation of Hayti. After the whites were murdered or banished, when the blacks and remaining mulattoes, seized upon, and divided the properties as the strongest could seize, they then sold or rented these out in patches of ten, fifteen, or twenty acres as they could. On these, a negro and his family, and again under him or with him, his relations congregated together into one place as could be agreed upon. At first the holder, or owner of the property where he rented it had one fourth the proceeds; but this being opposed by his free brethren, one half the produce is taken for rent. Such is the state and condition of agricultural society in St. Domingo.

But to come to a conclusion. "After all," says *Anglus*, *New Times*, September 14th, "I am not disposed to contend that FREE LABOURERS, either at Sierra Leone, or St. Domingo will VOLUNTARILY work as hard as slaves may be compelled to work under the Driver's lash—nor will free men and women, ever be brought to labour so intensely as slaves are compelled to do by the coercion of the whip," &c.

Oh! this "*lash*" and this "*whip*," my Lord, take these away, and anticolonial warfare is at an end. It is difficult to know for what *Anglus* and his friends *now* contend, but certainly they did most strenuously contend that the emancipated negro would work for hire, and for his own benefit, "THREE TIMES" as much as the slave. Steele's case and the Nottinghams' were *got up* to prove this! Let us hear what their great trumpeter, Mr. Clarkson says on this subject. *Thoughts*, p. 48.—"The slave stands over the work, and only throws the tool to avoid the lash. He appears to work *without actually working*." P. 42.—"Mr. Steele's slaves did

three *times* more work than before." P. 48.—"A negro if he worked for himself could do double work." P. 47.—"If he be a freeman, he does twice or thrice more work than when he works for his master." P. 49.—"The slave works three times harder for himself, than when he works for his master." Last year all the anticolonists followed in the same strain. A dangerous delusion was thus spread over the country, but which *Anglus*, though he formerly joined the rest, now denies and ridicules! *

To cultivate yams, plantains, cassado, and a few edible productions, necessary for a mere existence, is not to cultivate that agricultural produce which can add to the comfort, luxury, and civilization of the people of the Torrid Zone. What the emancipated Blacks in St. Domingo have done beyond this has been done by compulsion, severer or milder according to the disposition of the governing power. But still it is compulsion—and time only can determine whether they will cease to require it. The period, I speak generally, must be distant. But the question for Great Britain to consider is, not what St. Domingo *may* become, but what our West India Colonies *would become* from lawless emancipation, hurried on by *Anglus*—a scene of insubordination, anarchy, ruin—dissipation and immorality—for it is an adage, older than *Anglus*, my Lord, that "*where the Devil* finds a man (PARTICULARLY AN IGNORANT MAN) IDLE, he generally SETS HIM TO WORK." With these remarks, I shall, in my next, proceed to Sierra Leone. I am, &c.

JAMES MACQUEEN.

Glasgow, 27th October, 1824.

* Will *Anglus* dispute the following authority:—"It was stated by those who wished to induce their Lordships to the immediate abolition of Slavery, that the alteration would be nothing more than an alteration from compulsory to free labour, and that the Planter would derive more benefit from free than he now derived from compulsory labour. With respect to free labour, he must say that from all the information he had received upon the subject, he could not point out one instance in which the experiment of an alteration from compulsory to free labour, had been fairly tried and succeeded. Indeed he knew many instances in which that experiment had failed." (Speech, Earl Bathurst, March 16th, 1824.)

COLONIAL CONTROVERSY.

Nos. X.—XI.—XII.

SIERRA LEONE.

To the Right Honourable the Earl of Liverpool.

My Lord,

Before proceeding to the chief subject of this Letter, it is necessary to allude to St. Domingo for a moment, in order to notice the miserable quibble which *Anglus* makes at the *Quarterly Review*, about the termination of the American Official Revenue year, and that in Hayti, as affecting the returns of Coffee exports. The Revenue year of the latter is from 1st. Jan. to the 31st Dec. following; that of the Americans, from the 1st Oct. till the 30th Sept. following. Still, no "*Sophist*," but a Sierra Leone *Sophist*, would attempt to argue, that a comparison so made was an unfair one. In Coffee exports it cannot be so, because as the Coffee crop only begins in Nov. none can be fit for shipping, at least none is cleared out in loaded ships previous to the 1st January following, and the whole crop is finished and shipped, if not before the 1st of August, certainly before the 1st of Sept. following, so that even nine months of the American year includes, as regards Coffee, the crop of any one Haytian year, of 12 months. Equally unfortunate is *Anglus*, in his other quibbles about vessels in St. Domingo, clearing out to, and entering from European Colonies in the West Indies. There is a proclamation by Boyer, dated March 20th, 1823, prohibiting such a mode of trading, and forbidding all communication and connexion between St. Domingo and such Colonies, under the penalty of confiscation.

In venturing to touch Sierra Leone, or to enter into any

investigation of its situation and affairs, I am aware, that I am entering upon what may be called *sacred ground*, where any reference to truth and facts will infallibly subject me to every species of scurrility, misrepresentation and reproach. But truth must be told. The only thing that surprises me is, that this place, so much vaunted of, and continually thrust forward, as affording incontrovertible *data* to judge of the improvement and amelioration of the most savage portion of the human race, and to shew the rapid progress of industry amongst them, should be known only through columns, the interest and object of which is to mislead, misrepresent and deceive.

It may be proper to sketch the history of Sierra Leone, since its origin as a British settlement.

In 1787, Granville Sharpe, Esq. sent, under the direction of a few whites of superior intellect, 500 African blacks, picked up about London, to this place, in order to form a settlement which was to reform and civilize Africa. In a few months, about one half of these died, and the remainder unwilling to work, and refusing to build houses for themselves, continued to linger out a miserable existence amidst indolence, poverty, want and despair, till in a few years only 60 were left alive, and these scattered abroad amidst the surrounding petty Negro states.

In 1790, as the rage for every thing that was black increased, and became "*the order of the day*," a mercantile company, composed of philanthropists, and speculating merchants, and improvers of mankind was formed, in order to re-organize, or rather commence anew the work of Colonization at this fatal spot. Amongst the members or partners of the concern, were several of the leading members of the present African Institution. A capital of £240,000 or £250,000 was speedily raised. A charter for 31 years was as readily obtained. Supplies, stores, and settlers were profusely shipped to the place, and I believe my opponent *Anglus*, formerly a West India Planter, or to use his own language, "Slave Driver," was, on account of his experience in the way of cultivating Colonial produce, picked out, and sent to the place as a chief agent in the concern. The WHITES sent out at this time were of a *chosen* and *superior* breed, with affections elevated far above sublunary

things, (at least they said so) because the destinies of Africa were considered to be placed in their hands. Fourteen hundred Nova Scotian blacks, or the black soldiers who had joined and fought under the British banners in North America during the American war, were at great expense to this country, transported to this place; and shortly after, 512 Maroons from Jamaica, were carried thither at a proportional expense. The more supplies that were sent out the more indolent this population became. The Company charged enormous profits, 100 per cent. upon the articles furnished to the miserable settlers. Insubordination and discontent followed—blunder succeeded blunder, disappointment succeeded disappointment. The Company grew poor, their servants grew wealthy. The whole capital was swamped in the course of a few years, without a single return. One hundred thousand pounds more was raised to carry on the concern—it vanished as quickly as the other sum, without doing any good. The Colony remained in the most abject, forlorn and degraded state, without industry, without knowledge, without improvement, without morality, and WITHOUT RELIGION; when, to lessen the shame of discomfiture and failure, amongst our dearly beloved African Brethren, the individuals who had been engaged in the concern, had the address, in 1807, to get Government to take the place into their hands, to pay to the Company the last £100,000 they had advanced, and at the national expense, to pursue on the same spot, absurd plans for the improvement of Africa. The whole direction of the proceedings remained still in the hands of the active leaders and servants of the dissolved company, and the latter, and the latter alone, have reaped any advantage which has hitherto been derived from the place.

The whole scheme was a complete failure. "It produced," says the *Edinburgh Review*, vol. 15. page 494. "*no great improvement in Africa*"—and at page 493. says the same authority, "we must also allow, that a Colonial and mercantile speculation was little calculated to promote the objects in view, even if the Slave Trade had not existed; and the terms upon which this speculation was undertaken, were such as PRECLUDED almost all chance of succeeding."

And here, my Lord, a very serious point forces itself upon

me. *Mr. Clarkson*, in his work entitled "*Thoughts*, &c." pages 51 and 52, without reservation, sets down all the distress which our West India Colonies have laboured, or yet labour under, as proceeding from the displeasure of the Almighty, because of their transgression in continuing to hold slaves, the emancipation of whom he asserts would remove *that* displeasure. Mr. Clarkson will surely not deny that man may offend the Almighty in countries where personal slavery is unknown. His displeasure also, it will be admitted, must fall equally heavy on the head of moral delinquents in the Eastern side of the Atlantic, as on the Western side thereof. Time, place—transgression, meet no exception under his moral Government. If, then, the distress of our West India Colonists, whose CAPITAL, though unproductive, yet remains entire, proceeds from *their* transgression, how fearful must have been the moral depravity and wickedness committed in Sierra Leone, when *Anglus* was *factotum* in the place; and where the adventurers, not only never received any return for the capital employed, but lost all their capital, and still left the place unimproved! Admitting the correctness of Mr. Clarkson's reasoning, it is dreadful to think on. But the cause and effect are best given in his own words. "Has not the Almighty, in his Government of the world, stamped a character upon human actions, and given such a turn to their operations, that the balance" (gain he is here speaking of,) "should be ultimately in the favour of virtue? *Has he not taken from those who act wickedly, the power of discerning the right path? or has he not so confounded their faculties, that they are for ever frustrating their own schemes?*" Sierra Leone and its concerns do not, and cannot form an exception in the moral world. But I notice these things, my Lord, merely to point out the terrible dilemma into which men draw themselves, who have the awful presumption to usurp the attributes of the Omniscient and Omnipotent Being, and attempt to wield these in the moral government of this world. Reduce the duties on West India produce, my Lord, and West India distress will vanish.

The complete failure of every effort which has hitherto been made in and through Sierra Leone, to introduce industry, agriculture and civilization into Africa, leaves the friends and

supporters of the place no resource, but to deny boldly that ever any such objects were entertained by those who colonized it, and to assert, that it was merely resorted to as a point from which Christianity, without any reference to industry, commerce and agriculture, might be introduced into Africa. The boldness, my Lord, with which this assertion is made, and the easy credence it obtains, renders it necessary to adduce a few references from authorities which surely will not be denied or disputed by Sierra Leone supporters, to prove their error, and to shew what the object of the colonization of the place really was.

It is but very lately, my Lord, that I was informed by a Gentleman who held largely of the original shares, that he entered into the concern purely with the expectation of making beneficial returns from the Colonial produce to be raised by free labour in the place. When he found that his expectation was not to be realized, he sold out and got clear. Mr. Buxton knows the Gentleman well, to whom I now allude. The extract from the Edinburgh Review already adduced, might be deemed sufficient to settle the point, but I shall go a little deeper into the subject, and produce still more unquestionable authority. I have not at present the African Institution Reports by me, but *Anglus* will probably allow that the Critic in the Edinburgh Review, generally the Report writer himself, quotes them, and states the meaning of them correctly.

In vol. 15th. page 496. the Reviewer extracts from the 1st Report, p. 69—71. the following, as the objects, amongst others, which the African Institution had in view, viz.:—"3. To endeavour to enlighten the minds of the Africans, with respect to their true interests, and to diffuse information amongst them; respecting the means whereby they may improve the present opportunity of substituting a BENEFICIAL COMMERCE in place of the slave trade. 4. To introduce amongst them such of the improvements and useful arts of Europe, as are suited to their condition. 5. To PROMOTE THE CULTIVATION OF THE AFRICAN SOIL, not only by exciting and directing the industry of the natives, but by furnishing where it may appear advantageous to do so, USEFUL SEEDS and PLANTS, and IMPLEMENTS of HUSBANDRY." The Reviewer then, from the Report in ques-

tion, proceeds to notice and exult at the importation in 1808, of 10,000 lbs. weight of cotton from Sierra Leone, and the cultivation of the same article by Major Maxwell at Goree, and expressly and pointedly states, page 495, that, "for obvious reasons, THE SOCIETY DISCLAIMS ALL SCHEMES OF RELIGIOUS MISSIONS—it leaves in other hands the task of the propagating the Gospel among the Africans, and CONFINES its own exertions to the introduction of that CIVILIZATION which is the best PREPARATIVE for the truths of Christianity."

Here I might rest my proof, but I adduce further. In the Appendix to his famous letter to the Duke of Gloucester, 1815, at page 18, *Mr. Macaulay*, in "a PRIVATE" letter to Governor Ludlam, giving him instructions what to do, says: "The colony of SIERRA LEONE might be made extremely instrumental in opening the eyes of the Africans to their true interests: for not only might the example of profitable cultivation be there given, both by the present Colonists and by European adventurers; but a SCHOOL OF INDUSTRY might be instituted, in which *African youths might be instructed*, both in letters and agriculture, and the ARTS CONNECTED WITH AGRICULTURE, and who might go from thence to different parts of the coast, in order to communicate to others the knowledge they had themselves acquired. 5. INDIGO is, at present, one of the most profitable articles of tropical culture. This is an article, therefore, to which the attention both of OUR COLONISTS and the natives might be turned. *It is easy both of culture and manufacture.* 6. With the culture of cotton, the NATIVES are already to a certain degree acquainted; what would be wanted here would be to introduce among them, gradually, a better kind of cotton, and to instruct them in the modes of cleaning it which are in use in other parts of the world. 7. Of COFFEE I need say nothing, because attention has been already drawn to that article, both within and without the colony. Many other articles might be enumerated, which in the course of time may fairly become objects of culture. I have only mentioned these, to the production of which labour might *almost immediately* be advantageously applied." *Mr. Macaulay* then goes on to recommend the cultivation of *rice* as an article well adapted for the West India market, and proceeds: "I say nothing here of the

means which may be adopted for conveying the knowledge of letters and the light of Christian truth to different parts of the coast. I have confined myself to the enumeration of those means which may be suggested to the native chiefs for exciting that SPIRIT OF INDUSTRY among them which is the BEST groundwork of civilization!"

Here, my Lord, it is most distinctly admitted and laid down, that cultivation, agricultural industry, and the rearing of colonial produce were the great objects of Sierra Leone colonization. The settlement was to be "*a school of industry*," to teach all the rest of Africa, European arts and agriculture, as "the BEST groundwork of civilization," and the introduction of Christianity was a SECONDARY object. Will any one, after perusing those references, assert that the object of colonizing Sierra Leone was not to raise colonial produce, and thereby extend trade and civilization?

It is absolutely indispensable, my Lord, to ascertain the object in view, and the work which was undertaken, before we can determine the success or failure of either. With those facts before us, we shall be enabled to ascertain very exactly the result of the Sierra Leone concern—the Sierra Leone delusion!

When the settlement was taken possession of by Government in 1808, it was found to be in the most deplorable and dilapidated state, and it became necessary to be an at immense expense for every person and every thing in it. Since that period till the present the national purse has been at its service, unlimited, unchecked and unexamined. Prodigious sums have been lavished upon it. Besides about twelve hundred of the disbanded African corps carried thither from the West Indies at a great expense, above 20,000 captured negroes, according to Sir James Yeo's report, had been carried into the place previous to 1816, and above 10,000 more have been brought into it since that period to swell the ranks of its population. Still the place does not produce one article of colonial agricultural produce for exportation to Great Britain except ONE BARREL of coffee and 141 casks of rice for last year. It is even doubtful if these were produced in the colony. The few articles of its commerce, such as teak wood, elephants' teeth, palm oil, and camwood, are not the produce of agricultural

labour, and, moreover, are every one of them collected *without* the bounds of the Colony, by THE NATIVES of the respective districts. All those articles were to be found in Africa from time immemorial: they have formed, and yet form, in every part of that country, almost the only articles of her commerce, and almost in every place can be obtained better, and on terms more advantageous, than in, or around Sierra Leone.

The fact here stated, regarding the articles of its present trade, is confirmed by unquestionable authority. In *State Papers*, Class B, of 1824, Messrs. *Gregory* and *Fitzgerald*, Commissioners under the Slave Trade Acts, residing there, inform Mr. *Canning*, page 7. that the timber trade, in particular, is, *entirely* and EXCLUSIVELY, carried on by about 2000 families of the natives, established on the upper part of Sierra Leone River, without the bounds of our authority; and who, before the abolition of the slave trade, were employed in cultivating rice to supply the slave factories on the River, but which cultivation they ABANDONED when the trade was cut off by the British abolition. So completely are these natives dependant upon this timber trade that, in 1822, when a great stagnation took place in it, the Commissioners inform Mr. *Canning*, page 8. that "they were left without further employment," and that "no other means were left" but this trade to preserve them from positive misery and want; in consequence of which, and despairing of its revival, they were preparing *to commence the slave trade anew*, when a change took place in the trade for the better. And so little moral influence has the settlement had amongst the natives of that quarter, that, according to the same document, 3000 slaves are annually exported from the Gallinas, which is almost in its immediate neighbourhood!

Before entering upon the exposure of the expenses which Sierra Leone has cost this country, it is necessary to point out the influence which controls and directs it, and the counsels and advice which have been listened to and attended to in making it the capital of our African settlements, and the gulf for absorbing our public money, without any advantage whatever but to those who gave the advice, and who have the worldly wisdom to make every scheme intended for

the benefit of Africa conducive to their own emolument. On these points, Mr. Macaulay shall be my guide.

In the Appendix to his letter to the Duke of Gloucester, 1815, and at page 17. he informs Governor Ludlam, in a "*private*" letter, what the plans of himself and his colleagues were, namely, "to appoint a BOARD, which shall confine its attention entirely to Africa, and which shall comprise a few of those individuals, such as Mr. Thornton, Mr. Wilberforce, &c. who have interested themselves in Africa. 2. To place under the management of *this* Board NOT ONLY Sierra Leone, but Goree, and ALL THE FORTS on the Gold Coast." In page 16. he informs us, that he had "suggested" the propriety and the necessity of establishing a Court of Vice Admiralty at Sierra Leone, which would be found ready and convenient for condemning the captured slaves brought into the Settlement, where they could be established as labourers upon the apprenticing system, which he had previously pointed out as the readiest and most rational way of obtaining labourers to cultivate the soil, and this, according to Dr. Thorpe, page 69, subsequently to the bold attempt which Mr. Macaulay made in the African Society, or rather amongst the Sierra Leone Directors, to extend cultivation by purchasing slaves from the surrounding states, which scheme would have been agreed to but for the opposition of Mr. Clarkson and Mr. Sharpe! In his Letter to Lord Castlereagh, dated May 8, 1807, Mr. Macaulay proceeds to point out, that the "British interests in Africa and the improvement of Africa," rendered it necessary that all the establishments THEN formed in Africa, "or *any other* which may hereafter be formed" in that country, "should be taken under the *immediate command* of His Majesty;" that "a *Presidency* should be established at ONE of the settlements," and, adds he, for "reasons, now not necessary to specify, SIERRA LEONE is the BEST SITUATION for such a Presidency."

It is scarcely necessary to observe, that every thing has hitherto been gone into and appointed, as Mr. Macaulay "suggested," and hence we have the power, the influence, the "Board," which directs and controls it, and *through it*, all the British concerns and affairs in Africa.

Having saved, by his studies, His Majesty's Ministers "THE TROUBLE OF THINKING," Mr. Macaulay was himself, intensely employed, not only in thinking, but in acting, "*making hay while the sun shone.*" All these changes continually added to his patronage and his emoluments. British Africa, in fact, was his, and existed but for his advantage. "To such an extraordinary length did this influence extend, that some of the most distinguished officers going to the coast, were sent," says Dr. Thorpe, page lv. "from the Admiralty to receive their instructions from Mr. Macaulay, in Birchin Lane." The consequence of this influence was, that nearly the whole trade of the place fell into his hands. He had the whole supply of the navy stationed on the coast, nearly all the agencies of the navy, and of the African garrisons. If a convoy was to sail for Africa, the merchants at Llyod's, were referred to Mr. Macaulay, to ascertain the time of its departure. He was every thing for and in that Colony, and the bills drawn for the navy supplies on the coast of Africa, will at once attest the extent and profit of the traffic carried on, as we shall presently see what the extent of the agency commission may have been. Every thing was, in fact, under the control of Mr. Macaulay. He influenced and guided the African Institution in all money concerns; they, in their turn, influenced the country, and advised, or bothered the Administration, and, consequently, it was not very probable, that any one connected with Africa, or who wished to turn the penny in it, would venture to oppose the views of *Anglus*, go past him in business, or refrain from paying their court to him, or from doing every thing to please him.

But to proceed to state the expenses which this country has incurred by settling and maintaining this settlement. In the *New Times* of March 15th last, we are told, that the garrison consisted of the *2d West India Regiment*, and 100 Europeans. Upon looking into the Army Estimates for last year, I find that the 2d West India Regiment consisted of 899 men. Here then, my Lord, *adding the Governor*, we have a garrison of 1000 effective men, to a place containing *only* 16,000 *semi-savages!* I notice this part of the expense, my Lord, *first*, because the article which I quote as my authority, was written, I

believe, by *Anglus* himself, in reply to a very able statement in the *John Bull* of SUNDAY, March 14th. *Secondly*, because it shews that *Anglus* reads the JOHN BULL *on Sunday*, and not only reads it, but writes replies to it, also on that day, as the article to which I allude, consisting of nearly three columns, appeared in the *New Times* of the Monday morning following, so that *Anglus* must have had pretty hard work during that Sunday afternoon.

I shall take the year 1822, as the most correct data to go by, it being previous to any extra expenditure, occasioned by the war at Cape Coast. For that year, the Civil and Military Establishments stood as under, viz:—

Civil Establishment, ...	£22,616	17	0
Disbursements, by Commissariat account, ...	65,395	13	7½
Pay 2d W. I. Regt. Army Estimates, ...	26,868	12	7
Staff Officers and Medical Men, ...	2,413	11	3
100 European troops, in proportion, ...	3,500	0	0
A Chaplain to the Troops, ...	385	0	0
Navy Storekeeper and Clerk, ...	300	0	0
By Ordnance Estimates, &c.	6,224	0	0
Pensions, 1200 disbanded soldiers, W. I. R. at 8d. per day,	14,600	6	0
	£142,304	0	5½

But to these must be added considerable sums spent for the support of the Clerical Establishment, 15 Churches, and of course 15 clergymen; also for the erection of buildings and contingencies, which, for 21 months, in 1820, and 1821, by Mr. Grant, the acting Governor's account, were £14,950: 19s. 3¼d. On ONE CHURCH in Freetown, about £50,000 has already been expended, *and as much more will scarcely finish it!!* Taking these and other sums into account, the annual expenditure of Sierra Leone, exclusive of the naval department and the captured Negroes, cannot, at present, be less than £140,000 per annum, paid by Great Britain, and exclusive also, of about £7000, which the African scribes assert, is produced by the Custom duties in the place.

The following particulars, picked out at random, from the *General Financial Reports* for the last and the present year, will enable us to judge of the nature and extent of the expenditure at this place:—

JOHN ALEX. BOOBICK, Assist. Com. Gen. West Coast of Africa, from 25th July, to 24th Dec. 1815, ...	£29,188	11	10
Do. do. do. 25th Dec. 1815, to 24th July, 1816, ...	55,313	7	0
One year, ...	£84,501	18	10
THOMAS LE FEVRE, Assist. Com. Gen. W. C. Africa, from 25th Sept. 1817, to 17th May, 1820, ...	£134,989	11	3
JOHN RENDALL, Dep. Assist. Com. Gen. W. C. Africa, from 25th Nov. 1820, to 25th April, 1821, ...	64,976	1	7¾
Under head, Extraord. Exp. Army, 1822, p. 3, stands to J. BRUCE, Assist. Com. Gen. Sierra Leone, ...	29,891	15	5

The sum preceding the last, shews an expenditure, through the Commissariat Department alone, at the rate of £150,000 per annum!!

The expense incurred for captured Negroes, it is difficult to get at, but the following, picked out from the *Financial Reports*, for 1823, (p. 270, 296, &c.) and 1824, may serve to give a feeble outline of it:

Gov. Macarthy, from 1st Jan. to 30th June, 1814, ...	£23,630	7	8½
Alex. Grant, 1st July, to 31st Dec. 1820, ...	18,913	4	3½
Do. 1st Jan. to 30th Nov. 1821, ...	31,619	16	0
Gov. Macarthy, 1st to 31st Dec. 1821, ...	2,509	9	1½
James Barry, abolition slave trade, from 6th Nov. 1821, to 31st Dec. 1822, ...	3,481	0	0
Vote for expenses for captured Negroes, last year, *Financial Report*, 1824, p. 177, ...	40,000	0	0
For three years,	£120,153	17	1½

These, however, are trifling sums to what is expended in this way. It is obvious, at the above rates of expenditure, that it exceeds £40,000 per annum. Thus, in 1814, for half a year, the expenditure is upwards of £23,000, while, by Pap. No. 389, of 1824, it appears, that only 1950 Negroes, were that year delivered to the authorities. What must it have been in 1816, and 1822, when one-half more, were each year delivered into their hands? The accounts for last year, I am told, by one who saw them in the Colony, exceeded £50,000 for nine months! I cannot err far, in taking the average annual expenditure under this head, at £40,000 for Sierra Leone alone, independent of all other places. Every one of these Negroes are supported one year, at the expense of the British Government, and longer if necessary. In fact, a great pro-

portion "LEAN" on it always. They receive doors, windows, and locks, intrenching tools; clothing, consisting of shoes, jackets, trowsers, shirts, blankets, sheets, &c. &c. and daily rations of soap, beef, rice, and palm oil. The Engineer Department, supply those who are apprenticed, and they are allowed at the rate of 2s. 6d. sterling, per day, and the others, at the rate of 8d. per day; from which, it is obvious, that the expense annually, cannot be less than as above estimated.

The expensive system pursued with regard to these captured Negroes is, from first to last, most singular. They are almost all carried into Sierra Leone. If they turn out to have been unjustly captured, still they are not restored, but their value, £70 each, paid by this country. (*Marryat*, "*More thoughts still*," p. 96.) The captors previous to 1817, were paid at the rate of £40 for a man, £30 for a woman, justly or unjustly taken. Subsequently it was reduced to £10, and by the Act of last year to £5 for each.—While we paid the Spaniards and Portuguese £70 for each, they purchased them in Africa at the rate of £5: 10s. each, and when they escaped our cruisers, they sold them in the Brazils, &c. at £90. Under this system, no wonder the Slave Trade extended, for it became the interest both of the captors and the captured to carry it on and to see it carried on.

The expense of removing and settling the Maroons and Nova Scotians in Sierra Leone, I have no means of ascertaining exactly. *John King, Esq.* under Secretary of State, stated to the Committee of the House of Commons, that the general expense attending "the subsistence of the Maroons (exclusive of the removal) upon a *rough calculation*, amounted to not less than £10,000 a year. Mr. Macaulay in his letter to the Duke of Gloucester, p. 58, says, that the Sierra Leone Company received £18,000 out of a claim of £24,474, 2s. 5d. made against Government for money expended "*in settling the Maroons at Sierra Leone*, and partly for the maintenance of the King's troops, which formed the garrison of Sierra Leone." At this rate their settling and removal would probably cost the country £20,000, and the Nova Scotians being about three times their number, would at the same rate cost

£60,000.* Besides these things, Mr. Macaulay informs us in the same letter and page, that the Company had made a further claim against Government for £33,432: 3s. 11d. which it has been asserted was paid, and the "*Special Report*," p. 38, admits that Government paid them the further sum of £2000 for some buildings, not included in the general surrender of the settlement. The sum which Sierra Leone as it stands, has cost this country will therefore be—

Original Capital, ...	£350,000	0	0
Do. advanced repaid by Government, ...	100,000	0	0
Paid Sierra Leone Company for buildings, ...	2,000	0	0
Claim against Government paid by Company, ...	33,432	3	11
Do. Do. for settling Maroons, &c.	24,474	2	5
Additional for removing and settling do. and Nova Scotians, say, ...	60,000	0	0
Civil and Military expenditure, 17 years, but say only 16, at £140,000 per annum, ...	2,240,000	0	0
Captured Negroes do. at £40,000, ...	640,000	0	0
Naval establishment, share of, say	500,000	0	0
Removing and settling 1200 disbanded soldiers of West India Regiment, say £20 each, ...	24,000	0	0
	£3,973,906	6	4

Exclusive of every other national outlay from its first settlement till 1808. This was considerable. Mr. Macaulay in his letter, p. 39, already quoted, fixes the payment of the troops employed, upon Government.†

To abolish the slave trade and for the captures of negroes, we have paid as under, by Par. Pap. No. 539, 1821, and No. 177—1822, No. 43—1823, and No. 389—1824, viz.

Portugal loan remitted 1815, ...	£601,774	7	9
Do. by treaty 1815, for captures previous to 1814,	348,904	2	2
Carry Forward,	£950,678	9	11

* "*The Special Report*," appendix, page 139, says the Company in three years granted to the Nova Scotians in provisions alone, "about £20,000." Mr. Macaulay (Letter to the Duke of Gloucester, p. 39.) states that there "was an express stipulation on the part of Government, that the Maroons should not cost the Company one farthing," and that he considered the Nova Scotians to stand exactly in the same situation

† According to the *Report of the Committee of the House of Commons* in 1804, the expense to Government then was £14,000 annually. At this rate from 1792 till 1808, sixteen years, the additional expense will be £224,000 to be added to the preceding amount.

Brought Forward,	£950,678	9	11
Spain by treaty 1817, ...	400,000	0	0
Grants 1820 &1821 to defray Portuguese claims,	225,000	0	0
Bounties paid sundries by Treasury, ...	54,728	16	8
Do. by Navy Pay Office, till March 1822, ...	273,670	0	0
Bounties for captures above-mentioned, ...	65,000	0	0
William Cotton, prize agent, Sierra Leone, ...	3,703	19	10
Head-money, by Paper No. 389—1824, ...	56,017	16	8
Grants 1822 & 1823, &c. for Portuguese claims,	48,000	0	0
Interest sums advanced, about	700,000	0	0
	£2,776,799	3	1

Independent of a long, and I believe, heavy list of Spanish claims, and Portuguese claims still outstanding, and for several years £18,700 per annum (Par. Pap. No. 192 of 1823.) for defraying the salaries of the Slave Trade Commissioners. If we add interest for the sums expended upon Sierra Leone, we shall exceed eight millions sterling, as the price which that Colony has cost us!

I say, my Lord, eight millions sterling which that Colony has cost us, because nearly all the negroes which have been captured, have been carried into that place, and therefore the captures may well be said to be made for its benefit.—Each free black there, my Lord (supposing there are 15,000) labourer or idler, has cost this country, at prime cost, £220. I have, moreover, included the above expense in the cost of Sierra Leone, for two reasons. First, because to the ignorance of the Sierra Leone Directors, the greater part of these captures, for which we have had to pay such heavy sums, are to be ascribed. The Portuguese claims of 1815, were notoriously so. The 7th Report, tells us, that after the instructions emanating from them were issued, "the captures of vessels engaged in the trade *were numerous*—the examinations produced condemnation in the Courts of Admiralty, in a great majority of cases," and that all the slave ships captured on the coast, were "sent into Sierra Leone for adjudication." Secondly, I add these expenses to what has been expended, as I stated in my first letter, "*in, upon, and for*" that settlement, because Mr. Macaulay was, as he admits he was (*Letter to the Duke of Gloucester, p.* 38.) THE PRIZE AGENT, of the ships of war, which captured these negroes, consequently *all* the bounties, &c. went through his hands, besides large commis-

sions, and other advantages and emoluments which were attached to the office.

As PRIZE AGENT, it of course became necessary that Mr. Macaulay should have large sums of money from the public purse, at his command, to answer bills drawn on him for slave bounties. One reference may suffice to show the extent. Some years ago, according to the public papers, the Treasury called upon Mr. Macaulay to refund £45,000 or £50,000, which he had had in his possession for upwards of two years, with the interest, £5000. The money was of course returned, and the interest also, according to the public papers, after a prosecution for the latter had been talked of. The circumstance made a considerable noise at the time, and originated, not from any improper views, but from a misconception in the Act of Parliament, which, it seems, went to prevent the payment of any sums of money for slave bounties, until the slaves *were actually condemned;* whereas, the money in question was obtained, as it was said at the time, to pay for those who had been captured but not condemned. The advantage, however, of having such a sum of money in hand, to a prudent merchant, was certainly great. In looking at the previous statements, it will be seen that above £450,000 of bounty money has passed through the hands of the *prize agent.* The whole expenditure for and at Sierra Leone, during the last seventeen years, amounting to little short of £4,000,000, has, I may state, in some shape or other, passed through the hands of Mr. Macaulay or of his mercantile concern. Suppose that, in commissions, brokerages, &c. &c. 5 per cent. was realized out of it, which is certainly a low calculation, here is a sum of £225,000, or, at the rate of £13,000 per annum, during the last seventeen years, clear gain! Besides this, there were the commissions on outward bound cargoes, mercantile profits, contracts for all kinds of supplies in Sierra Leone, which none could furnish so well as Mr. Macaulay; and, taking all together, my Lord, we perceive a concern, the very "*cheese parings and candle ends*" of which are annually worth more than the salary of the Prime Minister of Great Britain!

Far, very far, be it from me, my Lord, to state or to insinuate that there has been any thing improper in all this. God forbid

I should do so. No doubt every thing has been just, and rigidly and fairly mercantile. But when I admit these things, I cannot forget that Mr. Macaulay is flesh and blood, and touched by the same passions and infirmities as others of the sons of Adam; remembering this; bearing in mind that *Anglus* is "THE FIERCEST PARTISAN" of the African system of delusion, and considering the deep *interest* he has at stake and to cultivate, I may, "*without attributing* to him venal motives," conceive and believe that in support of his theory, and his plans, and his interest, he will run into "heat, prejudice, exaggeration, misstatement and misrepresentation," to a degree that must render him a very "UNSAFE GUIDE," and dangerous authority to trust to.

Anglus may call what I have stated in this letter "*misrepresentation.*" Let him. That will not obliterate facts. In the previous statements, it is possible that I may have estimated the expenditure of Sierra Leone too high in some things, and for some years, but on the other hand, it is pretty obvious that there are years where the total expenditure remains hid from me. It will, however, be readily acknowledged that the *data* taken for my estimates, where the amount is not specifically fixed by official documents, are founded upon the *best* authority. The full official details disclosed can only determine the error where there may be error. *Anglus* may produce, or get these produced at his leisure. Should he ever do so, or should it ever be done, it will be found that I have not greatly, if any thing, over-estimated the cost of Sierra Leone. With these observations, I shall in my next proceed to point out what we have gained for all this outlay, the present situation of, and the system pursued in the place, and the scandalous deceptions concerning it, played off upon this country by those more immediately interested in, or connected with it.

HAVING ascertained the object for which Sierra Leone was colonized, and the expense which it has occasioned to this country, I proceed to consider what we have obtained for our enormous outlay, the present situation and condition of the

place, and the reprehensible misrepresentations and deceptions which are practised upon this country, in every thing connected with it.

According to the article in the *New Times*, already referred to, the population at the close of 1822, was only—"16,671," and this in the proportion of "*five males to three females.*" According to Hodgson, page 51, they stood as follows at the under-mentioned periods:—

	Feb. 1st, 1820.	Jan. 1st, 1822.
Europeans, ...	120	128
Maroons, ...	594	601
Nova Scotians, ...	730	722
West Indians and Americans, ...	0	85
Natives, ...	1,046	3,526
Liberated Africans, ...	8,076	7,969
Disbanded Soldiers, ...	1,216	1,103
Kroomen, ...	727	947
Total,.....	12,509	15,081

This, my Lord, is a very remarkable return. It exhibits a decrease of 107 on the number of liberated Africans, notwithstanding the addition to their numbers of 1557 in that space, (*Par. Paper*, No. 389—1824) being above 20 per cent.! and of 113 in the number of disbanded soldiers, being nearly 10 per cent. The Nova Scotians also have dwindled down in numbers above one half in a few years! Will our Sierra Leone Sophists shew me in the annals of mankind any thing to equal this, more especially in a place where the population has the blessed benefit of "THE MARRIAGE TIE," and where it is so religiously observed. Is death, debauchery, or cruelty the cause of this terrific decrease of the human species in this unhappy spot? With regard to the disbanded soldiers, I observe in a late West India Paper, that three of them have arrived at Martinique AS SLAVES, and how they became so, it is the bounden duty of those who have the keeping of His Majesty's subjects; particularly of "*our poor Pagan African Brethren*" at Sierra Leone, to explain.

With regard to the apparent increase of "natives" within the space mentioned, the way the return stands, without explanation, is a complete deception. Those enrolled as "*natives*" are in reality captured Negroes not proceeded against,

condemned and delivered over to the local authorities. Thus, according to Parliamentary Papers, No. 556, Session 1823, and No. 389, Session 1824, from 1820 to March 1823, about 5,400 Negroes were carried into the place, of whom only 3,976 were to the 1st January 1823, delivered over to the authorities as liberated, the remainder standing classed as "*natives.*" The total number of Negroes, according to Sir James Yeo, carried into Sierra Leone, previous to 1816, was upwards of 20,000, and from the Parliamentary Return of last year already referred to, greatly above 8,617, have been carried into the place (8,617 have been proceeded against in the COMMISSION COURT) to the end of 1822, making together 28,617—yet we find only *eleven* or *twelve* thousand, at the utmost, in the colony. What has become of all the rest?

But let us take the population, according to the *New Times*, at 16,671, Jan. 1st, 1823. According to Mr. Macaulay *(Exposure, p. 14,)* 6,000 negroes had been brought to Sierra Leone, of whom, according to the Special Report, p. 63, 1,900 had entered the army, leaving in 1814, 4,100. To the end of 1822 (Par. Pap. 389—1824) 9,570 more were brought in and liberated, which should have made the number, at the latter period, 13,670, and which, added to the other classes of the population, and the captured Negroes not liberated, would give a population of 18,673, instead of 16,671, shewing still a decrease of 2,002, instead of an increase.

But what must strike every one the most forcibly, my Lord, is the classes of the population here enumerated. With the exception of the few Europeans and the *Kroomen*, a migratory people, who travel when whim rouses them, and where they can find the labour which they like leads them, not one, I will say, *not one African* has come to the place from choice. The Nova Scotians, the Maroons, the captured Negroes, and the disbanded Negroes had no choice. Each and all of them were compelled to go there. Not a single native has voluntarily joined the population of the place, adopted our manners, chosen our laws, sought our protection, or acknowledged our sway. The population of Sierra Leone, my Lord, can no more be called voluntary residents, than the slaves in our West India Colonies can, and to talk of civilizing and enlightening

Africa, by catching as we can, on the high seas, or in other quarters, natives of the nearer or more remote countries in that great Continent, and then placing and retaining them in Sierra Leone as our subjects, and for the advancement of our agriculture and commerce, is as absurd as to speak about reclaiming that quarter of the world, by carrying slaves from it to America. Disguise it as we will, my Lord, it is only slavery and the slave trade in another shape, and the lamentation that is made about the laceration of the Negroe's feelings, in being separated from his family, and transported from his country to America, cannot be much different, or one whit more poignant, than in first being forcibly removed from his family—his country in Galla, Congo or Bornou, and next planted in Sierra Leone—a distance to him equally impassable, and points in Africa to him equally distant, and even more impassable than the other. If the Negroes from any other districts in Africa came voluntarily and placed themselves in Sierra Leone, under our sway, then the face of affairs would be changed; then, and not till then, might we hope to do good in Africa; but as yet nothing of this kind has been done or seen. Quite the reverse.

The trade of the place next demands our attention. According to Mr. Macaulay, *Exposure*, p. 38, and Mr. Marryat, "*Thoughts*," &c. p. 50, the average, for several years, subsequent to 1812, stood as under, viz.

	Imports.	Exports.
Average before 1816, ...	£70,000	£45,000
Do. 5 years, ending 1821 (Hodgson, p. 52)	81,600 *	
For 1823, Sierra Leone Gazette, April 24, 1824, ...	121,440 †	

* The Exports for these years were, viz:—

	Vessels.	Tonnage.	Logs timber.	Tons rice.
1817	17	2000	.....	.....
1818	22	3659	1517	278
1819	27	5875	2556	1228
1820	26	6805	4736	42

J. REFFEL, Act. Collector.

† Last year includes £3500 in imports from sundries not Europe.

Exports for 1823, were—Vessels, 44, tonnage, 7806—*Logs* African Timber, 1709.—*Billets* Camwood, 9709—*Do.* 303 tons, 13 cwt. 2 qrs. and 18 lbs.—*Palm*

or, on the average of twelve years, £91,000 in Imports. Of the increase of these, also, it may be here observed, that it took place only in proportion, and, as I believe I may state, in consequence of the increase of captured and liberated Africans. Indeed, the Commissary's account, ending July 24th, 1816, £84,000 for one year, exceeded the imports £75,716, of the place in 1817, and the expense for the captured negroes in some years was little short of the value of the imports, and exceeded the value of the exports, independent of all the other expenses incurred in the place.

Nor is the amount stated, properly speaking, the trade of Sierra Leone. It is well known that it includes that intended for a large extent of coast for which Sierra Leone has been made the port of entry, but to which parts vessels to trade could go, would go, and did go, before Sierra Leone was known, as a British port, and when it should cease to be one. Indeed, a great expense * and much inconvenience would be saved were vessels, without entering at that place, permitted to make coasting voyages as at other places. That the imports for Sierra Leone are the imports of a trade, such as I have just stated, is substantiated by the following unimpeachable authority—Last Session of Parliament, when a return of the trade to

Oil, 121 puns. 131 casks, 1018 pipes, 30 leagers, 1018 gs.—*Elephants' Teeth*, 6 cases, 1 pipe—5 *Casks*, 753 in number, 5 tons, 13 cwt. 3 qrs. 3 lbs.—*Gold Dust*, 233 ounces, 5 dwts.—*Hides*, 3180—*Morse Teeth*, 3 boxes and 56 lbs.—*White Rice*, 4 puns. 257 tons, 28 bushels—*Bees' Wax*, 3 boxes, 5 puns. 36 casks, 17 cwts.—*Gum Copal*, 59 casks, 1 box, 2 puns. 1 hhd. 3 tons—*Mahogany*, 10 tons—*Husk Rice*, 74 bags, 8 casks, 3030 bushels—*Farina*, 100 bags—*African Bark*, 2 casks—*Ground Nuts*, 20 bushels—*Coffee*, 21 barrels—*Malagetta Pepper*, 3 leagers, 5 pipes, 11 puns. 2 casks, 9 bags, 8 bushels—*Tortoise Shell*, 6 lbs.—*Chilies*, 22 casks, 126 bags—*Cask Honey*, one—*Arrow Root*, 2 kegs—*African Curiosities*, 3 packages.—*(Sierra Leone Gazette, April 24, 1824.)*

* *Anglus* actually boasts of this expense as a sign of the prosperity of the Colony. He says, *New Times*, March 15th, that the population of Sierra Leone pay more customs duties (8s. each) than any nation of the world, England excepted. We have always understood that heavy duties were the destruction of trade. The imports in 1820 were £66,725, the duties £6153, nearly *ten per cent!* and which the people of Great Britain have in reality to pay on their own goods in Sierra Leone, because THEY PAY all the money that is expended in that place! If the duties were at the same rate before 1816, then *Anglus* is grossly wrong in estimating the imports on an average from 1812 till 1816, at £70,000 annually, because *only* £5420 of duties were raised for four years ending 1806!

Sierra Leone was moved for, and ordered, the return produced was not the trade of Sierra Leone, but the *whole trade* to Africa from Mogadore to the Cape of Good Hope, with the remark that "NO SEPARATE RETURN for Sierra Leone could be made out," because "ships trading to Sierra Leone USUALLY CLEAR OUT WITH A GENERAL DESTINATION to the coast of Africa, comprehending the line from the Senegal to the Gambia, &c." Very little, indeed, of what appears as the imports of Sierra Leone is *bona fide* for that place, probably not more than the consumption of the captured negroes, and the scanty wants that the rest of the black population require, and which is paid for by bills drawn on the Treasury in London. This is obvious, from the difference between the imports and exports previous to 1816, viz. £70,000 the former, and £45,000 the latter. The exports from Sierra Leone are, almost without a single exception, articles collected in other quarters, and brought to it by the natives of those places. In 1823, ONE BARREL of Coffee reached this country from it, and any quantity of rice that is exported comes from other places *without* the limits of the Colony. It is notorious, and as we shall presently see the place does not even produce that article sufficient to supply its population. Of Palm Oil, the last African Institution Report informs us, that 10,000 galls. are brought from the Isle des Los. We may therefore safely take one-third from the value of the imports into Sierra Leone, as destined for other parts of the coast, and also take the exports in 1823 in proportion to the exports previous to 1816, as the trade of the place, or rather of various districts concentrated in its Custom-house.

The result, my Lord, will then be, that while the civil, military, naval, and miscellaneous expenses of the place, amount to about £210,000 annually, the imports and exports together, will not exceed £160,000 per annum, if so much!

Farther it results, that *to the continuation of the* SLAVE TRADE alone, is Sierra Leone indebted for nearly THE WHOLE of its present population. Without this, the population of the place would only have consisted of 100 Europeans, and 2,250 Maroons, Nova Scotians, and Kroomen, for the disbanded soldiers were generally captured Africans.—Strike away the Slave Trade

entirely, my Lord, and Sierra Leone, unless the whole system in it is changed, must not merely stand still, but go into "THE WRONG BOX," or "UNDER THE PLUMB TREE," most rapidly. Will *Anglus*, or can he contradict the previous facts?

The imports into Liverpool last year, stood thus:—from Sierra Leone *four* vessels—from other ports of the African coast, twelve vessels—into London from Sierra Leone, *thirteen* vessels—from other parts of the coast, *twenty* vessels, or nearly DOUBLE THE NUMBER of ships from other parts of the coast, to those from Sierra Leone; while, we have only to look at our import lists, to perceive how greatly superior, and how much more valuable the returns from the former are, than those from the latter. The principal trade, indeed, with what is technically called AFRICA, is with the coast, from Cape Coast to the Gaboon, and which, to carry on, does not cost the nation one shilling of expense. In these districts too, and by these districts only, the trade with Africa can be greatly and beneficially extended, for reasons which would be tedious, and which it is here considered unnecessary to explain.

Much, very much, my Lord, has been asserted and written about the superior productiveness of free labour, over slave labour in the torrid zone. But all the assertions are grounded in ignorance of the subject, and totally at variance with the truth. We have seen in the contrast of St. Domingo, how little free labour, even under compulsory laws, produces, compared to what that island, under a different system, formerly did. In Africa—Sierra Leone, it produces not only no surplus produce, but not a sufficiency to support itself. Yet the system, by a dangerous and sudden change, is recommended for our West India Colonies, as a *panacea* for all their ills. "With respect to free labour," said Earl Bathurst, March 16th, "he must say, that from all the information he had received upon the subject, he could not point out ONE INSTANCE, in which the experiment of an alteration from compulsory to free labour, had been FAIRLY TRIED and succeeded. Indeed, he knew MANY INSTANCES in which that experiment had failed." Sierra Leone stands an unimpeachable and existing witness of the truth of what his Lordship stated.

The United States, my Lord, the people of which, are noted

for their industry and activity, afford us a striking example of the falsity of what our inconsiderate anticolonists assert. According to the American official returns, their exports of native produce

And manufactures, are	47,155,711 dolls.
In which value Cotton, rice and tobacco are, ...	31,811,978 ...

or *two-thirds* of their exports from the labour of *one-seventh* of their population who are slaves! The labour of their free people of colour, amounting to nearly 200,000, not only produces nothing, but they are considered a nuisance in the community, and measures are at this moment in progress to get the whole transported from the country to Hayti, or any other place which will receive them.

It may not be uninteresting to contrast the imports and exports of various countries, with the exports of our West India Colonies, as compared with the population respectively. When I say exports, I confine myself to the exports of the native produce and manufactures of every country mentioned, except the East Indies, where the value stated, includes all the exports of every kind.

	Population.	Imports.	Exports.
G. Brit. & Ireland,	21,000,000	£30,500,000	£36,968,963
Ireland, ...	7,000,000	6,771,607	7,871,237
United States, ...	11,000,000	* 11,341,091	10,609,534
East Indies, ...	140,000,000	7,149,558	8,421,550
South America, ...	17,000,000	7,102,193	†2,191,117
West India Colonies, ...	841,000	7,000,000	10,000,000

On the score of productive industry, the best criterion of the mildness and equitable nature of the Government of any country, our West India Colonies have, therefore, nothing to fear or to feel ashamed of, in the comparison and in the contrast with the most industrious people, and the most civilized nations on the earth.

It is impossible, my Lord, to quit this part of my subject without contrasting the present situation of the British Colony of NEW SOUTH WALES, with the colony of Sierra Leone, com-

* This sum is the imports from foreign parts retained.

† Those imports and exports are with Great Britain only. The exports from these places are chiefly in specie and bills, which do not come under the British Customs' returns.

posed of our African Brethren. Both Colonies were begun about the same time. The latter was protected and lauded by the Mother Country, the former scarcely ever occupied her thoughts. The one was composed of the picked population of Great Britain and Africa, the other of the very worst and most profligate and most criminal of our population. Yet mark the consequences and the superiority of European intellect and European talent. While Sierra Leone scarcely produces any thing agricultural, and though situated on a Continent, containing 150,000,000 of people, thirsting, as we are told, for knowledge and tired of bondage, still it contains only 16,000 souls. New Holland and Van Dieman's Land, British Colonies, planted amidst a few wandering savages, contain at the end of 1821, a population of 37,068—have 655,145 acres of land held, 80,768 acres cleared, and 47,184 acres cultivated. The Colonists have 4,564 horses, 102,939 horned cattle, and 290,168 sheep. The income from their labour, amounted that year to £471,375. From Hobart town last year, 16 ships, 5,500 tons cleared out for Great Britain, with cargoes consisting of wool, oil, &c. worth £100,000, exclusive of wheat to the Cape of Good Hope and Rio de Janeiro. The trade stood thus:—

	Vessels.	Tons.	
Imports, 1823, from Great Britain,	35	10,518	£180,715
Do. 1821, do. India & China,	18	3,719	238,185
Total, ...	53	14,237	£418,900

(*Par. Pap. No.* 186, of 1824.—Wentworth, vol. 2d, p. 328) —almost equal to the whole trade with Africa; which, for last year, by Par. Pap. No. 269—1824, was, exports £302,213 (£119,000 of which were foreign goods) and imports £132,292.

Such is the difference, my Lord, of working with African materials of the best description, in their own country and climate, and with European materials of the very worst description in a distant country, a different climate, and planted there under every disadvantage. Had the New Holland convicts been governed as our African brethren have been, and are governed at Sierra Leone, or had the former been pampered, and indulged, and supported like the latter, the results would undoubtedly have been similar.

Whether we take Sierra Leone as an agricultural, a com-

mercial, a geographical or political point, on which to fix ourselves in Africa, it is equally ill and injudiciously chosen. A worse situation could not possibly have been pitched upon. The soil in it, adapted for agriculture, is extremely circumscribed. Rising into hills, there is little soil upon them, and that being washed away almost as soon as cleared, leaves an unproductive waste behind it. The mountainous district behind the settlement, either shuts up all communication with the richer and better cultivated districts in the interior, or leaves only a communication most difficult and most expensive, so much so, that it never can come in competition, either in agricultural produce, or commercial collections, with those reared and carried on, along and by the fine water communications, and rich level plains that extend from the mouths of the great rivers in the Bights of Benin and Biafra, northwards towards the interior. One fact may be deemed sufficient to shew this. Palm Oil, notwithstanding the very tedious passage from the Rio de Formosa, to Sierra Leone, collected round the former, can be produced in the market of the latter, at a lower price than that produced in and around the settlement. Depend upon it, my Lord, that produce and articles of every description produced in Africa, can be brought from these places, and merchandize conveyed to them, at a much cheaper rate than to and from Sierra Leone. To make such a place, or to expect that such a place will become the emporium of African agriculture and commerce, is a wild dream, which, to indulge in, is fatal both to the interests of this country and of Africa.

In its political position, it brings us in contact and connexion with none of the great or the more civilized states in Africa, and never can bring us into any such connexion. Only a few petty states of the most degraded of the African population surround it, poor—indolent, and miserable—ignorant, and totally, or at least, more than any of their brethren in other quarters, unacquainted with knowledge and civilization. The consequences must be, that these will always remain the most averse to come in contact with civilized life, or to bend their necks and their minds, as stiff and untractable as the wild ass of the desert, to its laws and to its sway.

Looking at its position in a geographical point of view, it

is still worse and more objectionable in every way, but more especially in making it the capital of our empire in Africa. All our naval officers are perfectly aware of the difficulty, and the almost impracticability, of beating up from the Bights of Benin and Biafra to Sierra Leone. They have, I believe, one and all, pointed out and remonstrated against this fatal and ruinous system. But, my Lord, on this point let one fact and authority, which my opponents will not cavil at or deny, speak for me. "THE LONDON NEWS from Cape Coast," says the *Sierra Leone Gazette* of March 13th, 1824, "IS TO A LATER DATE than *our* last accounts from that settlement, and tends to shew that the war with the Ashantees is still devastating the country!" Volumes written on the subject could not place the error, of making Sierra Leone the capital of British Africa, in a more prominent and unfavourable point of view. What! receive news from Cape Coast, at Sierra Leone, by way of the West Indies and London, sooner than from the former place direct! Yes; such is the fact. Can *Anglus* deny it? and, acknowledging it, will he hold up his face to this deluded nation, and justify the policy pursued in making, or rather in striving to make it what he has made it, or wishes to make it? *Impossible!*

It is impossible, my Lord, to peruse without contempt and indignation the pompous details almost daily put forth in this country about the industry of the captured negroes and the flourishing state of their agricultural labours. The fact is notoriously the reverse. They are idle and averse to labour, and generally supported at the expense of this country. Let unimpeachable authority again support me in what I here advance. There lies before me, while I write, three Nos. of the *Sierra Leone Gazette*, viz.—Jan. 31st, March 13th, and April 24th, 1824, in each of which there is an advertisement for 150 tons of white rice for the captured negroes, and in the contract advertised in the paper of March 13th there is also sought 5000 gallons of palm oil, I presume, to rub the fine sleek skins of our African brethren. Here is 450 tons of rice to be delivered between the 11th Feb. and 24th July ($5\frac{1}{2}$ months) or about £7200 for this article alone! This rice so contracted for, I will add, is produced in Negro States beyond the bounds of

the Colony. I challenge *Anglus* to deny or refute those facts, and call upon the gulled and deluded people of this country to open their eyes and attend to them.

Before entering upon the consideration of the present condition of the place and system pursued there, it may not be improper to point out a few instances of the impudent and unblushing deceptions which are played off upon the credulous people of this country by those connected "BY TIES OF BLOOD and INTEREST" with the place—with this "FEVER GARDEN," this "PEST HOUSE," and "GRAVE TO EUROPEANS," and I may add, this LUNATIC ASYLUM of Africa.

In the Appendix to the Tenth Report of the African Institution, 1816, the reporter gives some extracts from letters dated Sierra Leone, December, January and February preceding. These state, or are made to state, that the conduct of the settlers is said to differ VERY LITTLE from that of the generality of ENGLISH VILLAGERS. The captured negroes, on the other hand, subsist solely by agriculture.—Sierra Leone is supplied with FRUIT and VEGETABLES almost exclusively from their plantations. ALL the settlers are now married in the manner prescribed by the Church, and the institution of marriage gains ground even among the captured negroes. One correspondent observes, "I was present last week when 23 couples were married, all captured negroes." Next the Reporter proceeds to extract parts about numerous schools, and numbers of tractable scholars, in the same way that he himself and his great coadjutor, the Edinburgh Review had done for years preceding. A sentence overturns their delusion. The Rev. Mr. BROTHERSTON stated at a meeting held at Manchester, on the 14th June last, that he had been in Sierra Leone in 1816 (subsequent be it remembered to the date of the preceding accounts) when the population was "GENERALLY IDOLATERS,"—and Sir James Yeo of the same date says, that they were without order or industry. So much for their boasted industry, and being "all married in the manner prescribed by the Church," when they were "generally idolaters," and without order or industry!

In the last African Institution Report, we are exultingly told, that last year Sierra Leone merchants received in one

transaction, gold dust to the value of £1000 sterling, brought down by interior traders. "The merchants have occasionally received from £500 to £1000 worth of gold in a single day, in exchange for goods!" (Rep. p. 40, New Times, Oct. 23.) The return of the exports for last year previously alluded to, gives us 233 ounces FOR THE WHOLE YEAR, instead of that value obtained in one day, and for one transaction!!

The disastrous war carrying on at Cape Coast, is well known. The Sierra Leone Gazette of the 14th August last, alluding to the famine prevailing there, and the high price of rice in that settlement for some time previous, proceeds, "a large supply will be required for the service of the Gold Coast, no less than 800 tons, *we are told*, have been tendered by SOME MERCHANTS OF THIS COUNTRY!" The *New Times* of October 4th, takes up the subject thus:—"We have received Sierra Leone Papers to the 14th August inclusive. The Peninsula was in a very flourishing condition. The LIBERATED AFRICANS AND DISBANDED SOLDIERS, at the settlement of Kent, had begun to cut rice for the season. The Colony having been for some time short of a supply, the price of that grain had risen, and the rise was augmented by the demand for supplying the Gold Coast; SOME OF THE SIERRA LEONE DEALERS, having tendered 800 tons for that purpose, and yet we are week after week, told by a *Sunday* Paper, that FREE LABOUR in these countries, cannot be productive!"

"Reasoning people in this country," my Lord, who read the preceding extracts, would no doubt conceive that the whole 800 tons of rice, asserted to be tendered by "SOME Sierra Leone *dealers*," were the production beyond consumption of free labour—captured Negroes in Sierra Leone. Alas! such "*reasoning people*," do not know Sierra Leone tactics, nor Sierra Leone sophistry. The whole 800 tons of rice—16,000 bags, have been lately purchased in the London market, and two ships are now engaged to transport it to Sierra Leone and Cape Coast. In the General Export List of London, Oct. 12th, we find entered for Cape Coast, 2,557 cwt. American, and on Oct. 14th, 6,979 cwt. East India rice! I challenge *Anglus*, in the face of my country, to deny these facts, and call upon him to adduce me, if he can, more deliberate chicanery,

and more scandalous perversions of truth than I have here exposed.

How great and how scandalous this system of misrepresentation and exaggeration has been and is, my Lord, is sufficiently attested by the severe lamentation set up by the *Sierra Leone Gazette* of Jan. 31st, 1824, on that account, and the severe reproof given by it to the propagators of such delusions. "We have to offer our earnest request," says the Gazette, "that *these men* who express their friendship to this Colony will not allow a *mistaken zeal or enthusiasm* to carry them into the extreme, and by too high a colouring, raise the ideas and expectations of our friends at home to too exalted a pitch." On their own heads their arts will return at last.

Sierra Leone, my Lord, not only does not raise supplies of any description sufficient for its population, but its most material supplies, both for internal consumption and exportation, are drawn from the surrounding districts of country, and states yet remaining in their barbarous state of darkness and ignorance. In them a greater degree of industry, and activity, and of cultivation prevail than under the British flag at this place. A great proportion of the people in Sierra Leone do not join in agricultural labours, which they reckon a disgrace, while a considerable portion of those who are set to employ themselves in that way do very little, and those who do cultivate the ground, cultivate only for the same purposes as every Negro in Africa does, even amongst nations the most rude, namely, to produce a few vegetables and edible roots, which are raised and produced in that climate by the least possible labour. That even this too was lately but partially undertaken, we learn from a correspondence in the *Sierra Leone Gazette* of July 24th last, where the writer says, "Those lots of land which were FORMERLY LEFT TO GROW UP WITH WEEDS, or to the range of the *swine*, are now better applied, and those animals are now carefully penned up in one corner of the yard, while the remainder, as A GARDEN, grows whatever is necessary for the subsistence of the inhabitants." "The REMAINDER AS A GARDEN," is, my Lord, the whole cultivation amongst the liberated Africans in Sierra Leone, where any of them really attempt cultivation. Of this natural indolence and invincible opposi-

tion to labour for profit, we have a striking proof in the fact so pointedly stated by Sir George Collier, that "the streets of Freetown are as much covered with indigo as formerly," yet not one lb. of indigo is exported from the place, though Mr. Macaulay informs us it is "*easy of cultivation.*" In the *New Times* of Oct. 18th, an inhabitant of Sierra Leone, in reply to this damning fact, does not deny it, but says, that the particular fact alluded to by Sir George, "may have been occasioned by the rapidity of vegetation in the rainy season. Where indigo grows wild, nothing but CAPITAL CAN BE WANTING to make its growth and manufacture *extremely productive!*" Capital wanting in Sierra Leone! Capital wanting in a place where, and towards which we are told, all the feeling and all the wealth of England are directed! Impossible! However, this one fact is plain and incontrovertible, that though indigo grows wild—even in their streets, yet not a plant of it is cultivated—not a particle of it is manufactured, though bearing such a high price, and finding such a ready market in Great Britain!

Cotton, my Lord, which was cultivated, has been abandoned, for what reason *Anglus* may say, and I think I have a right to call upon him to tell. Raising Coffee has scarcely ever been attempted, though its mode of cultivation is well known, and by no means laborious. Sugar cultivation has never been tried except by *Anglus*, when he was there. It was, however, given up. He may say why. He indeed attempts to say it is on account of its being subjected to the Foreign Duty in Great Britain. This will not do. The same markets—all the markets in the world except Britain, were open to it, that are open to Sugar from any Foreign Country or Colony, and if the produce of Sierra Leone, could have undersold the produce of either *free* or even *slave* labour in other quarters of the world, then it would have commanded the market, and been profitable. That this has not been done is a proof, either of the unconquerable indolence of the people, or of the high price of labour in the place, OR BOTH. *Anglus'* letter, No. 2, *New Times*, Sep. 10th, taunts the *Quarterly Review*, and the West Indian Planters on this subject, and calls upon them to bring in a Bill into Parliament, to allow Sierra Leone Sugar to come into Britain, upon equal terms as West India Sugar. The greatest punishment

the West Indians would inflict upon their opponents would be, to bring in such a Bill. Limit the Sugar to be admitted to the produce of the present Colony of Sierra Leone in its widest bounds—abolish the whip and the chain there at present in use, and let them bring what Sugar they please. Sugar from Sierra Leone! It must, my Lord, get a different soil, a different people, and a different mode of governing them. If the West Indians wish to cover their relentless enemies with everlasting ridicule, let them bring in the Bill alluded to with the restrictions mentioned. Sugar from Sierra Leone! Why, my Lord, we might as well look for a crop of wheat on Snowden, or barley on the summit of Benlomond!

With these observations I shall proceed in my next, to point out the present situation of this "*Grave to Europeans,*" and the system of management pursued, expressing my regret that the subject has swelled in my hands to the extent it has done. The importance of the details, however, as these are to be, or may be applied to the great Colonial question, "the radical developement of the grand question of free and slave labour," will, I hope, be deemed a reason sufficient and satisfactory for taking up so much of your Lordship's time, and for intruding so far and so long upon the patience of my readers.

We have seen what Sierra Leone has cost us, we have also seen what Sierra Leone produces, and it is now time to consider the system pursued in the direction of its affairs, and the present situation of the place.

My Lord, it will not, I think, be denied by any one, but a thorough bred Sierra Leone "*partisan,*" that if we wish to benefit Africa, to enlighten and to civilize Africa, that we must keep Africa in the belief, that *white men* are their superiors in intellect and power. Our Government there, as in India, must be the Government of opinion—we must try to raise the savage to our rank in the scale of civilization, and not to sink civilization to the scale of savage intellect.

Strange, however, my Lord, as it may appear, the latter has been the system pursued in Sierra Leone. All the world

knows the sentiments of its patrons concerning the two races of mankind, the *whites* and the *blacks;* which are, that the latter are not merely equal to the former in many respects, but vastly superior in most. The oracle of Mr. Clarkson, *Abbe St. Venant*, says the *Edinburgh Review*, vol. 15th, page 494, "describes the Negroes as possessing *bodily qualities*, FAR SUPERIOR to those of other men; and states it as a strong argument for effecting a counter Revolution in St. Domingo, that if to such physical powers, intellectual culture were added, THE NEGROES MIGHT CONQUER THE WORLD." They think so also in Sierra Leone, my Lord; they act upon that belief. Hence their failure.

The late Governor Sir Charles Macarthy, who was quite an enthusiast about blacks, though previous to his death, his ideas of their capabilities and dispositions were, from experience, much cooled, did every thing he could, in union with the views and opinions of the Sierra Leone patrons, to bring his colour in Africa to the level of the black. He was in the habit of giving public entertainments, to which he invited indiscriminately white, black, and yellow of both sexes. An invitation given to the first class also, was in such cases considered as a command to be present. Tradesmen and labourers of the lowest *grade* of the liberated blacks were invited to these entertainments, while *white* tradesmen were overlooked. At the head of the motley assemblage the Governor took his seat. At his table as the most distinguished guests, was to be seen the flat nosed and thick lipped African savage, but yesterday engaged in eating the raw flesh of his companions, REQUIRING, not *requesting*, the white *lady* to take a glass of *rum* with him, or the British officers and civilians, to take a glass of brandy, wine or porter *(all de same Massa)* with him, and they with him in return. The officers, however, much to their honour, shunned as far as possible, such degradation. The few white ladies also fought very shy on such occasions. Their converted lords, however, who delighted in the equality which renders all things common, would sometimes *command* submission, and were less scrupulous, in fact, considered it their indispensable *duty* to pay their court, and lend their countenance to the black ladies, while "their wives and their daughters" were left

to choose between bandylegged Quamina and Quashie. Any wry faces, or contemptuous looks at our African brethren or sisters, or, at the offered hand and embrace of equality were dangerous, and were not long in finding their way to "*Birchin Lane*," or elsewhere, amongst those who believe and expect that the *Negroes will conquer the world*, and Sierra Leone subdue Africa. Such exhibitions were not more impolitic than dangerous. They destroyed all respect for the whites, and the belief in their superiority of mind, and accordingly raised barbarity, ignorance, and physical force to the level of the former, which, it is scarcely necessary to add, must for ever prove an invincible bar to submission and obedience in the latter.

No respect whatever is paid to white men by the blacks. If a black insult a white in the streets, which they are very ready to do, and if the white, of whatever rank, resent the insolence in any way, a complaint is immediately lodged at the police office, and the aggressor is almost sure to be exonerated, and the insulted reprimanded. The word of the black is every thing. The word of the white goes for nothing. The only reason for this partiality is, as Mr. Stephen would express it, because the skin of the former "is BLACK." The extent to which this equalizing system is carried in the place, is truly astonishing. At a public ball, a black carpenter knocked down the King's advocate, who was compelled to pocket both the hurt and the affront. At Government balls it is quite common for our Naval Officers to be pitched against a partner in the dance, whom they recognise to be their washerwoman, while the next moment they are accosted with rude familiarity by a black man, demanding a bottle of porter or a glass of rum, as the remuneration for the liberty of dancing with his "SISTER." Every thing has its price in Africa. The white ladies, if they are so fortunate as to escape "*the wrong box*," or keep ABOVE "*the plumb tree*," shun these scenes of humiliation by flying to England by the first opportunity that offers. The consequence of these equalizing and levelling proceedings are, that the name of Sierra Leone and the characters of the whites in it, are rendered the butt, and the scorn, and the reproach of the rudest natives of Africa, and while it is attempted to drag down European civilization and intelligence to their level, they not

only remain in their original state of ignorance; but what is worse, those near our settlement learn and imbibe the vices of civilized life, without any one of its virtues.

The natives around have learned nothing from us. In fact, little is practised in Sierra Leone that is useful to the barbarian and the savage. Agriculture, the foundation of all civilization, and the want of which is the surest *datum* to judge of the state or degree of barbarism which prevails in any country, is, correctly speaking, unknown in Sierra Leone. Some of the negroes cultivate country provisions, but the place, as has been already noticed, does not produce even these sufficient for its consumption. The cultivation of cotton begun in 1808, by the Messrs. Andersons of London, and for the importation of 10,000 lbs. weight of which they obtained a prize of £100 from the African Institution, while Europe rung with the gift and the cause, has been abandoned. The cultivation of other Colonial produce is not thought of on any scale worth mentioning, or indeed, I may say, on *any scale*. The captured negroes, or rather the liberated Africans, never hire themselves to work at agricultural labour, and are indeed never required to do so. Some of them work a little for themselves, but it is just at what and when they please. They do not raise even country provisions sufficient for their own consumption. They are generally and long supported with extravagant daily rations, at the expense of the British Government, such as rice, palm-oil, soap, beef, &c. &c. and it is notorious, that the rice, palm-oil, and even beef, are purchased from the natives of the surrounding districts, without the pale of our authority. These liberated Africans consider these rations as their unquestionable right; any attempt to withold these, or any delay in serving them out, makes them importunate, clamorous, and discontented, and being BLACK, they must be indulged, pampered, and kept idle. A mercantile firm connected with a Mr. Macaulay gets the profitable contracts for these rations, and your Lordship may find upon a cursory inquiry, that there are wheels within wheels, as in an Orrery, some above board, and others below unseen, in African contracts, which can turn the arm with the favourite mark, to stop at a particular letter in the alphabet, or which in the circle reaches the destined goal,

before its above board competitors. At any rate the arm must stop at the last letter in the alphabet. It is vain to turn it farther.

If the rations to these negroes are extravagant, the wages they receive are still more so. *Anglus*, my Lord, for *Anglus* I believe it is, in the article *New Times*, March 15th, boasts of this, "In the Sierra Leone Gazette, Feb. 21st, 1823, says he, we find a letter from an inhabitant of Freetown; complaining of the very high and unreasonable wages *demanded* by and *paid* by all descriptions of mechanics and labourers in the Colony. He asserts that a master carpenter or mason receives from four to six shillings per day, though he may be WELL SUPPORTED FOR TWO SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE." I request your Lordship's particular attention to this and to the words "well supported at two shillings and sixpence" per day. The wages, my Lord, given not to "*master* carpenters and masons," and other mechanics, but to journeymen black carpenters, and liberated African labourers, by the late Governor, were at the rate of 7s. 6d. per day for the former, and 5s. ster. per day for the latter, even if merely engaged in carrying stones! But by whom was this paid? By the Treasury of Great Britain—out of the pockets of every one of us, for although the labour was for Sierra Leone, the wages paid for it, were paid out of no private or public income earned or raised in the place. For apprenticed Africans, 2s. 6d. per day is allowed. They can be, *and are* maintained for 10d! Such is the state of luxury in which even these labourers live, who work only as they please, that I am informed by an eye-witness to the fact, it is common to see them taking their wine after their dinner! And, my Lord, I know where *Anglus* boasted and defended this intolerable extravagance, as a proof of the prosperity of the place.

It is a deep insult, my Lord, to the deluded people of this country—to the poor labourer and mechanic in it, who toil 16 hours per day, for the wages of 9 or 10s. per week only, or Irish labourers at 1½d. per day, to hear of such extravagance, and the boasts of it, when in some measure it is at the expense of the sweat of their brows. It is more particularly galling, my Lord, when we recollect the unparalleled sufferings of the poor emigrants to Canada and the Cape of Good Hope, whose la-

bours really tend to increase the wealth and resources of this country. It would appear that if they only painted their skins black, that then they would have an undoubted, irresistible claim to be supported and kept idle. *Anglus*, my Lord, ought to have the common prudence to keep silent on such subjects. They cannot meet or stand the inquiry they provoke. And when he boasts, *New Times*, March 15th, of the subscription of £140 per annum to the Auxiliary Church Missionary Society, from the population of Kissey and Freetown, and the present of a sword worth 100 guineas to Lieut. Hagan, by the merchants of the latter place, for his active services on the coast, * and adds, perhaps it will be said, that "*the means* of paying taxes and contributions, are supplied by *compelling* the liberated Africans to toil for little or nothing, making them, in fact, only exchange one kind of slavery for another;"—when he speaks and boasts of these things, he should be more cautious, and less arrogant, and less confident. In some instances, liberated Africans may "be compelled to toil for little or nothing," but the "merchants" and people of Sierra Leone, have an easier way of "paying taxes and contributions," namely, by drawing on the Treasury of Great Britain "for little or NOTHING," and charging a heavy commission for doing so!! Shall such proceedings continue for ever?

The merchants in Sierra Leone, I am informed, shew gross apathy in business, but this is not to be wondered at, when they can pick up fortunes in contracts and Government Bills. The Maroons carry on almost all the trade between Sierra Leone, and the nations in the interior. They buy the goods from the import merchants, and, carrying them up the river into the interior, exchange them with the nations at a very great profit, and while they do so persuade these natives in the interior, that Sierra Leone is such a wretched place, that nothing can exist in it, and that if they should ever venture

* In STATE PAPERS, Class B. 1824, page 32, we find the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, expressing himself that the conduct of this officer "WAS HIGHLY REPREHENSIBLE,"—and further that "the Lords of His Majesty's Treasury FULLY AND ENTIRELY CONCURRED in the sentiments expressed by Mr. CANNING!" Thus we find his Majesty's Ministers, severely condemning the individual whom Sierra Leone merchants reward!

there, they would either be eaten or sold as slaves! Many people from the interior are consequently afraid to visit the settlement. These Maroons have learned all the jesuitical sophistry of the place. When reproached with the deception by those whom they have attempted to deceive, they state, "We did not mean that white men would eat you, but that death would." So far they save their conscience, and are in some measure correct.

Beyond the limits of our authority, our power and our example, where we set an example, have had no influence upon the natives in a civil, moral, or religious point of view. They shun, instead of courting connexion with our establishments, and resolutely adhere to all their ancient customs, practices, laws, and manners. No impression whatever has been made upon them in any one thing. They have learned nothing from us, and reject our customs, our manners, and our dress. The latter, in a particular manner, we attempted to force upon them. The country without the bounds of the colony is much better cultivated by the aborigines than the land *within* the colony by the settlers of any class. This is so well known in Africa, that the *Timmanees* and other tribes laugh at Sierra Leone prosperity, and boast that the place is dependant upon them for its existence. To court the favour and win the affections of the surrounding tribes and states, we make them presents, not of dresses which befit men in such climates, and such as would be useful to them, but of cocked hats and gold laced garments, the dress of European nobility and of officers of the highest rank, which the more ignorant and savage either despise, or, by the possession of these trifles, became idiots, from the weakness of their minds, and from a principle of vanity, deeply rooted in human nature, but particularly strong among all classes, male and female, in Africa.

"The conduct of the disbanded soldiers of the late 4th West India Regiment," says the article in the *New Times*, March 15th, "has been throughout *examplary*, and their habits *industrious*. They have about 500 acres of *cleared* and cultivated land." My information, my Lord, regarding these people, and from sources which knew them well *in* Sierra Leone, is directly the reverse. They are generally idle, in-

dolent, and dissipated. Every one of them, young and old, sick or healthy, have a pension of 8d. sterling per day—yea, even those among them who engaged in mechanical pursuits or labour, are receiving at the same time, from 5s. to 7s. 6d. per day! So little do such require the pension, that they conceive it a hardship to be obliged to attend, at fixed periods, to receive it; and have had the assurance to require, that the person who paid the pension should *call round* upon them with the amount! Is it, my Lord, to be wondered at that people so pampered and indulged should be idle and dissipated?

Mr. Stephen, in the Special Report of the African Institution, 1815, asserted, that the Maroons were the worst, idlest, poorest and most turbulent part of the population from the vices they had contracted in West India Slavery! The Maroons were not slaves! But, my Lord, I assert, upon authority which knows Sierra Leone well, that the Maroons are, at this day, the most orderly, cleanly, industrious, and independent part of the population of Sierra Leone. They have the best houses, the best clothes, and take the greatest care of them. They live separate from the rest of the population. Accidents are scarcely ever known in their quarter of the town, whereas, in the abodes of the liberated negroes, broils, fires, and other casualties are, from their idle and dissipated course of life, very frequently taking place. The knowledge the Maroons gained when in contact with civilized life in Jamaica places them superior, not inferior, to their fellows. Nor is this improvement from being in the West Indies confined to them only. The *Sierra Leone Gazette, New Times, Oct. 13th*, asserts and boasts, that "the Disbanded West India soldiers are rapidly advancing in the more difficult parts of cultivation, from THE KNOWLEDGE *they obtained*, AS SLAVES *in the West Indies*. BY THESE MEANS many of them have been enabled to gain property sufficient to build stone and frame houses in which they reside with their wives and families. Their habits are *industrious*, and their general conduct *excellent*." A more singular admission, and disclosure of facts of importance to be known have seldom been produced than are conveyed in the words just quoted. The disbanded

African soldiers were not all slaves, my Lord. Many of them were liberated Africans, inlisted or rather enrolled at once into the service without choice. Others were purchased as slaves by Government in the West Indies, and liberated when disbanded. Their improvement in useful knowledge and industry when slaves in the West Indies, from witnessing the civilization there, I admit and believe, and in doing so remark, that the fact is the best and strongest argument for slavery I ever met with, and coming from the pen of a Sierra Leone sophist is irresistible. Had I advanced such a fact, *Anglus*, would have immediately proclaimed me, an advocate for slavery and the slave trade in the abstract. Whenever these Sierra Leone sophists write, my Lord, we are sure to get at some part of the truth.

The houses, or rather huts, of the Sierra Leone liberated negroes are composed of the same rude and simple materials as other huts amongst uncivilized Africans. Wherever there is found a more substantial house, it has been built at the expense of the British Government. Indeed our export lists furnish abundant evidence that house frames are sent from this country ready to put up, because these cannot be got made there, and the quantity of deals and fir timber frequently exporting to the place, while it confirms the expense, shews that Sierra Leone is dependant upon external supplies for houses to cover the heads of its population.

The liberated Africans are much addicted to thieving.—Goats or sheep rapidly disappear around their villages, and the losers or the Police, where such is established, will often find the remains of the animals with their throats cut, stowed away under the bed-posts in their dwellings. The more irreclaimable are, as a *dernier* resource, banished to Cape Coast, become the Van Dieman's Land of Sierra Leone. There they are decidedly the outcasts of society. They neither work at the timber trade nor any other branch of commerce as in Sierra Leone. The Kroomen perform the labour of loading and unloading ships. In Sierra Leone, supposed in Britain to be an earthly paradise, the blacks, males and females, are subjected for misbehaviour to severe flagellations by a superintendent, or who would more vulgarly amongst us be called

an executioner, by order and at the discretion of magistrates. For some offences, chiefly immorality, they are chained together in long bands with collars round the neck, the chain extending from the neck of the one to the collar on the neck of the other. I have seen, says my informer, hundreds of them chained in this manner, ten in a string! I do not mean, my Lord, to question the justice of this, but merely observe that it is singular that iron chains and collars (rarely used) should be such horrid things in the West Indies, and such pleasant, pious objects, when frequently used in Sierra Leone.

Men, my Lord, I mean white men, in this happy spot, are subjected to passions like men in other places. A negro boy chanced to let a horse belonging to a white man, which he was holding in the street, escape from his hand. This *free* boy was immediately "CART-WHIPPED" most dreadfully, and crammed into a dark cellar without a drop of water, where he soon died. The white man was brought to trial, and upon the evidence of a Missionary, celebrated in this country, to the point of character, was found guilty of "*manslaughter*" only. That ever the sentence of the law was inflicted upon him according to that verdict, is, I think, doubtful, as I perceive he has again returned to Africa, after being in England, although he stands, by last Financial Report, a defaulter on his account to the extent of £11,000! I do not mean to question or find fault with this trial and verdict; but merely to remark, that had any thing of the kind taken place in the West Indies, there would have been an extraordinary meeting and a special report, and an alarming cry about our poor black brethren; but occurring in Sierra Leone, it is passed over *sub silentio*, and as a matter of course.

Some time ago, my Lord, a son of the King, who reigned in Sego, when Mr. Park was at that place, and who treated him kindly, having a complaint in his eyes, was sent to Sierra Leone for medical advice. His journey was successful. An operation was performed which preserved his eyesight. During the time he was under the Doctor's hand, he was placed under the care of the Rev. Mr. Johnson, who wanted to convert him from the Mahommedan faith. The boy resisted his importunities. Quarrels betwixt them became frequent

Matters ended by the Reverend Gentleman causing the boy to be MOST SEVERELY FLOGGED, who fled to a gentleman in Freetown for protection, inquiring at him if he had been sold as a slave! After his recovery, he accompanied a gentleman into the interior, served him most faithfully, became a Christian from mild reasoning and good example, returned to his father, who immediately sent a messenger with his thanks and a present to the gentleman for his kindness to the boy; and adding, that should either he or any other white man ever visit Sego, his friendship and protection should most cheerfully and certainly be extended to them.

It is proclaimed by Sierra Leone trumpets here, that liberated negroes sit on Juries. In some instances, I am informed, by those who have with shame and dread witnessed it, they really are sometimes placed in the jury box. But a more grievous humbug was never witnessed. The Judge is in fact the Jury in such cases, and from the bench guides the box and tells them how to proceed. On such occasions, they are brought forward as a foolish doating father brings forward his young children to shew how clever he thinks he has made them at their age. By chance they may stumble on what is just. A white man lately drowned himself in the Sierra Leone River. The Coroner assembled a black Jury—went to let them stare at the body. How to proceed they knew not. He told them that, under all the circumstances of the case, they must return a verdict of *felo de se*. No, said a negro, who thought himself wiser than the rest, that will not do, "*He no fall into de sea;* he drown himself!" But what to say was the question; it was settled by the over-ruling *ipse dixit* of the Coroner, who *commanded* them to do what was right, but what some of them believed to be wrong.

The morality of the place, my Lord, does not exceed that of others, and scarcely equals the scale of the surrounding African states. The liberated females, when they descend from their mountain villages to the more demoralized atmosphere of Freetown, are found sufficiently liberal of their favours, and secret *amours* are not greater strangers in these abodes than in other quarters of the world which get a worse name. Proof positive soon began to meet the light in the

appearance of a race of human beings of a colour between the white and the black, who shewed that "the mixing of the races" had been going on, and against whose testimony no evidence could contend. The missionaries and the clergyman of the established church entered into an alliance to refuse the rites of baptism to all such intruders, unless the *reputed* white fathers married the black mothers. This was resolutely refused, though one of the missionaries, to encourage them, set them the example by marrying a black woman. Still the whites held out till his Excellency the Governor became a transgressor, and had a mulatto child produced to him by his mistress, whom the Rev. Mr. Johnson baptized, and thus broke up the confederacy formed against "promiscuous intercourse," when things went on in their usual course, or to use Mr. Clarkson's favourite phrase, the *free* population "continued to labour as before." One good thing, however, one of those Missionaries did, in order to wipe away some scandal from the place, he made a white man of some consideration in the colony, who had brought out a white *mistress* with him from London, marry the girl, and which punishment, as it is conjectured, put a stop to several contemplated similar emigrations to the place.

Marriages are entered into amongst the liberated negroes, more from an awe of authority, than from any conviction of the propriety or morality of the rite. These marriages are performed on a Friday. The husband is told he must support his wife in all time coming, and under all circumstances. This restriction, though the African does not openly oppose, he secretly abhors. He immediately secrets his purse from his partner; she complains to the Police Magistrate, whose power is despotic in the cause. The word of the woman, is taken as the rule of the law, and though she may be the most profligate character, and spendthrift, and drunkard, the unhappy husband is coolly told, that he is a rogue, and must go home and give his wife whatever she wants. Much misery is produced by those inconsiderate marriages—but "the whip and the chain," stand in terror before them. Far into the interior of Africa, these Sierra Leone matrimonial *fracas*, and police decisions, are made a subject of scorn and ridicule, and at the

sources of the Niger, the traveller will be told of Sierra Leone—"*dat country no good—dat woman's country—dat no man's country.*"

With regard to the religion of the place, my information assures me, that much deception is practised upon the people of this country, on that head. It is in a very low state. The Sabbath is generally spent by the whites in excursions amongst the mountain villages, in order to breathe a purer atmosphere.

The generality of the Missionaries there employed, teach the Negroes, that they must turn all their attention to the next world; that the cares and labours of the present, are beneath their notice and unworthy their regard. More dangerous principles than these, taught without reservation to the savage, naturally indolent, and abundantly supplied by Government, cannot well be conceived. It is directly contrary to the true spirit of Christianity, taught by the greatest of all the Apostles, and exemplified by the Saviour himself, that "he who would not work, so neither should he eat." Industry, my Lord, is the first thing to teach the mere savage. Till he knows and appreciates its value, Christianity will have but a feeble hold on his mind. Upon the introduction of Christianity amongst the civilized and industrious inhabitants of the Roman empire, we find from the Apostolic writings, that many of them took or mistook it for a license to commit licentiousness, and if such a woful mistake took place amongst them, can we wonder or feel surprise, that a similar fatal error should be imbibed, and of course pursued amongst a few African savages, but yesterday brought from their wilds, and restrained from devouring human flesh? Certainly not; and when men talk of as great, nay, of greater perfection amongst them, than is to be found in civilized Christian States, they undoubtedly tell us what is not true.

The missionaries chosen and sent out by the Society, which has the political as well as the religious patronage of Sierra Leone, are really the Governors of the place. No one dare question or dispute what they say or do. It is totally out of the question for any authority to attempt to oppose their views and plans, however obviously wrong and imprudent these may be. The support they receive in this country, from many

excellent but deceived men, makes every one tremble at their frown. I wish not to be mistaken or misunderstood. Let every assistance, countenance, and support, be given to men engaged in disseminating the truths of Christianity: but, as the principles of that doctrine which they teach and profess requires, let such confine themselves to their proper sphere—let them not be placed above Government, nor impede the operations of civil and political power which exert themselves for their protection and support.

The fables related of this place, are almost incredible in this enlightened age. Thus, one of the Magazines devoted to the cause of deception, the Evangelical, I believe, tells us, that at a public meeting in London, the Rev. Mr. Johnston told his audience, that at his departure from Sierra Leone, the nails were worn off his fingers, by shaking hands so closely and so frequently with the affectionate Negroes. The audience swallowed the story, though they all saw the flesh on the fingers was unbroken. One gentleman from Sierra Leone, who was present, and knew the reverse, and afraid that he might be appealed to, to corroborate the statement, and knowing that truth in certain quarters would not be palatable, told my informant, that he slunk away into a corner, when he heard "THE BIG LIE." Often he told the story in Sierra Leone, where they laughed at the credulity of the people of England. For the truth of what I state, I may, I believe, safely appeal to a respectable gentleman, high in authority in Sierra Leone —to *Kenneth Macaulay, Esq.*

The business of all in Sierra Leone, or connected with it, is to delude and deceive Government with false representations regarding the place. Even those who are the greatest enthusiasts in the cause of African civilization, and who are sensible of and reprobate the system pursued in Sierra Leone, join in keeping up the delusion, and join in it, from views honourable in themselves—namely, that if Government was undeceived, and saw the extent of the delusion practised, with no progress made in the great object in view, they would abandon Africa altogether, whereas, if they continue to lend their aid and support, though wrong at present, they may get into the right way at last. In this way many of them reason; but on the other hand, there

are others who have pursued a system with unbending resolution, "to save His Majesty's Ministers the trouble of thinking," who obstinately continue in their error. From such, Africa may exclaim, in the language of the Liturgy, "Good Lord deliver us!"

The puffs and paragraphs, my Lord, in the Gazettes of the place, and also in other Gazettes, are all written to meet the public eye in this country, and I *know*, formed the subject of many a merry joke and remark, over the glass of wine at the dinner tables of the great in Sierra Leone. No exposure of the follies pursued, and the ruinous system carried on, ever could be permitted to appear in the Colonial Gazette, though I know and assert, that application was oftener than once made to do so. Such a system, my Lord, must cease. We must see the difficulties which lie in our way in Africa, if we wish or expect to overcome them. We must take Africa as it is, not as Sierra Leone sophists represent it to be, if we wish to do good in that country.

Our proceedings in it at present, are directly at variance with the interests of Africa, as well as our own. The practice of our cruisers, compelling the native chiefs to deliver up slaves intended to be shipped, or supposed to be intended for shipping in vessels off the coast, in order that the captors may get the head money for them, is attended with fatal consequences. In the Bight of Benin, where that has been tried and carried into effect, the native chiefs have been so exasperated, that they have driven away the peaceable British merchants long settled amongst them, carrying on legitimate and honourable commerce, the only method by which the chiefs of Africa can get their eyes opened to their true interests. Such has lately been the fate of Mr. Houston, with whom M. Belzoni lately died in the Bight of Benin. My Lord, such things ought not to be. They are, however, lauded by Sierra Leone merchants, who think it will bring more trade to their quarter. They are wrong. It only throws the trade into the hands of foreigners.

Africa, my Lord, in general, is positively a savage country. The elements of human society, of agriculture, and of commerce exist in it, but sadly debased, scattered and broken, and

it will require a mind of no common penetration, energy and firmness, to collect these elements together, arrange them in becoming order—to bring order out of confusion. Still, my Lord, with all these things before us, I believe some good could be done in Africa, both for Africa and for ourselves. But to bring about this good, we must get out of Sierra Leone as fast as we can, or only retain it as a secondary station, if it should be found worth the retaining on such a scale, which I much doubt. We not only can never do any good worth mentioning there, but by adhering to it much longer, we shall lose for ever the advantages which we might otherwise be enabled to obtain.

Sierra Leone, my Lord, I believe, was, and is intended, as an experiment of what could be done by Europeans in Africa, animated with philanthropic views, or directed by interested speculations. Above all, it was an experiment made to induce the Africans to become civilized, abandon their superstition, renounce their errors, and give up the slave trade, slavery and indolence—and having become industrious to cultivate and produce all kinds of Colonial produce. No part of these objects has as yet been realized. Either the whole are impracticable, or the system adopted, and the course pursued are wrong. I am willing to believe that the latter is the case. But if we are to extend our views and our schemes, to even the half of Africa, as is really, loudly, and confidently proclaimed by those who patronize Sierra Leone, it is evident that it would cost this country, at the Sierra Leone rate of expenditure £24,000,000,000 of money to reduce the one-half of Africa, even to the same state in which we at present find that settlement! We must try some other plan, my Lord, something more reasonable and rational, or abandon the pursuit altogether.

With two or three short remarks, I shall close this part of my subject. If I have been misinformed, I shall be happy to be set right, by *unbiassed* and competent authority.

The hold which order or authority have over such a population, is extremely feeble. Like schoolboys, the moment they are let out from under the master's eye, confusion follows, and the lesson is neglected—like soldiers liberated from the command of their officers, insubordination follows, and discipline

is forgotten. An hour's relaxation or liberty, will destroy the work of years. The Sierra Leone Gazette, of March 13th, 1824, supplies us with a striking fact, illustrative of this point, and of the feeble root which improvement and order have made in that place. Lamenting the death of Sir. C. Macarthy, the Editor says, "It is well known to us all, that this Colony owes its present prosperous and happy state, *more to the continued residence*, and individual exertion of his Excellency for *many years, than to* ANY OTHER CAUSE; and, that his absence is a *drawback upon our improvement*, is as STRONGLY VISIBLE to an observer, as it is SENSIBLY FELT and deplored by all classes of the inhabitants of this Colony."

The whole Custom Revenue, *on all* the imports from Africa, amounts only to £26,084: 13s. 9d. for last year, which is £2,660 less than in 1814, (Par. Pap. No. 269—1824) which shews a decreasing, not increasing trade. Probably not a third is derived from Sierra Leone exports. The Customs duty, on West India Sugar alone, exceeds £4,500,000 sterling, per annum. Shall the latter be sacrificed for the former?

Exclusive of "*the cheese parings and candle ends*," and exclusive of commercial profits, *Anglus* and his friends have, for a number of years, derived, perhaps £13,000 per annum, from the Sierra Leone FREE LABOUR concern. No wonder that he writes in support of the system. He also is the chief writer who comes forward to beat down our West India Colonies. It is evident, he is so deeply interested, that his judgment must be biassed, and consequently he must be an "UNSAFE GUIDE." Unquestionable authority informs us, that a man cannot *faithfully* "*serve two Masters*"—cannot "SERVE GOD AND MAMMON."

I am, &c.

JAMES MACQUEEN.

Glasgow, 12th November, 1824.

COLONIAL CONTROVERSY.

Nos. XIII.—XIV.

JAVA, CHINA, &c.—LABOUR—FREEMEN—SLAVES, &c.

To the Right Honourable the Earl of Liverpool.

My Lord,

Our anticolonists adduce two special reasons, namely, oppressive government, and gross immorality and irreligion, which should induce us to forsake the West Indies, and transfer our favour and our interest, and our money to China, Cochin China, Java, &c. This being the case, it is proper we should consider the Governments established, and the morality and religion which prevail in the countries mentioned, that we may see the propriety and the policy of the transfer, and of the selection which we are called upon to make.

In Java, ostentatiously brought forward by *Anglus*, the wages of the free labourer is from ONE TO TWO DOLLARS PER MONTH! Yet with labour at this rate, the few European cultivators who attempt to raise sugar in Java, find, notwithstanding the great returns from a fertile soil, that their produce—sugar and coffee, cannot meet the sugar and coffee of Cuba and the Brazils, taking quality into account, in the European markets. Nor is it the *natives* of Java who carry on this sugar cultivation by numbers collected into one place, *but the Chinese*, an industrious people, whom poverty had forced from their own country; and who, accustomed to labour, are willing to undertake it upon the most trifling remuneration, or from dire necessity and absolute want. But the native of China will succeed, and will labour freely, when the African savage and barbarian will not, unless he is compelled. In Java, the 10th Report of the African Institution informs us, there are 40,000

slaves, but these, in general, are, it would appear, kept for domestic labours; and the labours of the field are performed by freemen—CHINESE.

"In Java, the Europeans are commonly waited on by slaves from several Indian islands, of WHOM THEY KEEP GREAT NUMBERS in their houses, as the heat of the climate will not permit two slaves to do as much as one at the Cape. The ladies especially are attended by a great number of slaves, and seldom pay a visit without a whole retinue of these attendants." The punishments inflicted upon slaves in Java, it is well known, are exceedingly severe. Impaling alive is the punishment for great crimes. The free white women in Java are, and not without reason, jealous of their husbands and female slaves. When any discovery takes place, "they torture the female slaves in various ways, they have them whipped with rods and beat with rattans, till they sink before them nearly exhausted. Amongst other methods of tormenting them, they make the poor girls sit before them in such a posture, that they can pinch them with their toes in a *(here delicacy forbids me from quoting the words of my authority,)* with such cruel ingenuity, that they faint away by excess of pain. They revenge themselves upon their husbands, by following their example."—*(Stavorinus, Pinkerton's Collection, &c.)*

Rice, it is well known, is the staple commodity of Java. Sugar, says the *Edinburgh Gazetteer*, a work compiled from the latest and best authorities, is chiefly made in *Jacatra*, and the quantity manufactured annually amounts to about TEN MILLIONS of pounds for home consumption and exportation. * The sugar mills are kept and worked by the Chinese. "The Javanese inhabit the interior of the island. They are an exceedingly indolent race, and nothing short of POSITIVE COMPULSION, the want of the necessaries of life, or the prosecution of some of their favourite amusements, can ROUSE THEM from their habitual apathy.—The interests of the body of the people are entirely at the disposal of a numerous set of chiefs, who exer-

* By East India Rep., 3d app. p. 39, 89, 91, &c. the quantity manufactured is 13,006,808 lbs.—about 8,400 hhds. According to Crawford, it was in 1818, increased to 27,200,000 lbs.

cise over them *the most arbitrary oppression*, and subject them to a variety of injuries. In fact, *the people seem to exist* ONLY FOR THE BENEFIT OF THEIR CHIEFS. It has been calculated, that in some of the eastern provinces, a husbandman possessed of sufficient land to maintain two buffaloes, derives from the fruits of their tillage and labour, *only one fourth part* for himself and his family!!! The Javanese are polygamists." They, marry as many wives as they can maintain, and take their FEMALE SLAVES besides, for concubines. Like the negresses at Sierra Leone, "the Javanese women are extremely partial to Europeans. The dwellings of the natives are miserable places. The whole house usually consists of but one apartment, in which husband, wife, children, and sometimes their poultry, of which they keep a great number, pig together on the ground. They have neither tables nor chairs." *(Stavorinus, &c.)*

These are called, by *Anglus*, *free labourers!* This is Java, and this the situation of the people of Java!!

In China and Cochin China, it is well known, that besides being under Governments the most despotic, and consequently political slaves, a great number of the people are, besides, personal slaves, and from their labours much of the exportable produce is raised. Much of the sugar exported from China, comes in the first instance, I believe, from Siam, and from Cochin China the country where more is produced than in any other country in the east. Sugar is its staple article of export, but it has never yet been found a profitable market for European merchants to visit. Siam exports a great quantity of sugar candy to China.

The Government of Siam is the most despotic and arbitrary, and barbarous and cruel, on the face of the earth. To his subjects the King is unknown. They are only sensible that they have a master, by the dread he inspires, or by the oppressions he orders. It would be profanation to the Majesty of this tyrant to mention his name, or to inquire after his health. Young girls are torn, at pleasure, from the arms of their parents, to gratify his passions. To avoid this fate, the parents sometimes bribe the officers employed in this service to report them objects unfit for the Royal embrace. The King is the CHIEF MERCHANT, and has factors in most of the neighbouring

countries. The subject is never, in reality, possessor of a field or a garden; since, if the productions are esteemed, a soldier comes and claims them for the King, or some favourite Minister. Officers are appointed to serve elephants with ceremonies, humiliating to human nature, and the omission of which would incur punishment. The Siamese believe that these docile animals contain the soul of some Prince or Sage.

The people are in a miserable state, and worse even than the meanest slaves. They are compelled to work SIX MONTHS each year for the King in the most laborious work, and, during all that time, TO LIVE AT THEIR OWN EXPENSE. The slaves are more privileged than the freemen, as the former only work for a master, who maintains them. The furniture of the houses of the FREE population of Siam consists merely of carpets and cushions. They have neither beds, chairs, tables, cabinets, nor paintings. The children go entirely naked till about the age of five years. Grown up persons appearing in a state of nudity does not alarm their modesty. They attach an idea of baseness to works which require strength, and every thing which is troublesome, to them appears mean. The indolence of the Siamese, or rather want of sufficient motives for exertion, prevents them from making any considerable progress in manufacturing industry. The lot of females is exceedingly severe in this country. The *heaviest part* of the labour devolves on them. They CULTIVATE THE EARTH, *cut wood, get in the harvests*, prepare their husband's food, while he amuses himself in games of chance, or dozes away his time. They are not allowed to eat in his presence, nor to go in the same boat or carriage with him. He avenges himself in his domestic empire for the slavery he endures. The common people are mostly occupied in procuring fish for their daily food. They also eat lizards, rats, and several kinds of insects. The value of about *one penny* sterling suffices to procure a poor man his daily pound of rice, with some dried fish and rack. Their religion is the grossest idolatry—they uphold the doctrine of the transmigration of souls. The Government is purely DESPOTIC, and the Sovereign is revered with honours almost divine. The Royal marriages are sometimes incestuous, and the King does not hesitate to marry his own sister. Polygamy is allowed. A *temporary*

amorous intercourse is rather forbidden by the pride of the sex, than by any moral or legal considerations, being considered as a BRIEF marriage, and inconstancy as a divorce. Few women become nuns till they are advanced in years. *(Loubere, &c.)* Marriage is contracted by a few visits and a few presents, without any further ceremony, *civil or sacred.*

Slaves, I mean personal slaves, are numerous in Siam. They are born or become such. The insolvent debtor or prisoner of war is deprived of his natural liberty. Slaves in Siam are allowed by their masters to hire themselves to other persons, upon a certain remuneration. A great part of the country consists of mountains, covered with forests and wild animals, and fit only for hunting; while, at their feet, are extensive swamps and jungles, equally unproductive. The Siamese fix themselves near rivers. As you get to a distance, the country is found less inhabited, and few travellers have been tempted to penetrate into deserts, whose stillness is only interrupted by the howling of wild beasts. Notwithstanding the fertility of its banks, the country along the sides of the river of Siam produces *few commodities* which may not be obtained elsewhere, EQUAL OR SUPERIOR IN PLENTY AND QUALITY. The sugar cane is abundantly raised, though chiefly for home consumption. The natives do not possess the art of refining it.

The prisons in Siam present an affecting object. Multitudes of miserable beings languish in them, to whom all compassion is denied which is shewn in other countries to useless and mischievous animals. The Government do not feed them. They are seen in bands wandering about from door to door, begging their subsistence. Devoured with hunger, they often snatch what is refused to them. Their lot during the night is still more cruel; they shut them up in a large circle of stakes, in two rows, covered with leaves. Besides the chains upon them during the day, they have their feet confined between two pieces of wood, and their neck goes into a kind of ladder, *from 6 to 7 feet long.* The punishments inflicted upon criminals are horrible. For sacrilege, the wretches are fixed down by chains, so that they cannot move, and then a fire, which is lighted into fury by two bellows, is placed at their heads to consume them by degrees. For the crime of assassination, a stake is driven

by a club, from the *anus* of the criminal upwards, till it comes out at the stomach or the shoulders, when he is left to expire in torments, &c. (See the French of *Turpin*, and the *Edinburgh Gazetteer*, &c.)

Such is Siam, the country and the people. Another place from whence *Anglus* attempts to bring anticolonial armour, and another spot singled out by him, as deserving our particular care, attention and regard.

In Cochin China the Government is also PURE DESPOTISM. The religion is similar to the religion of China.—Besides a CAPITATION TAX, amounting to about 12s. sterling upon each male, from the age of 18 to that of 60, EACH SUBJECT IS OBLIGED TO LABOUR FOR THE SOVEREIGN DURING EIGHT MONTHS IN THE YEAR. Property is little respected, the King commonly seizing upon the estate at the death of the possessors, and LEAVING NOTHING to the children, except the money and moveables. THE CONSTITUTION IS ENTIRELY MILITARY. The ladies usually do all the business, while their lazy lords sit upon their haunches, smoking, chewing beettle, or sipping tea. Contrary to the custom of China, the ladies are not shut up, and if unmarried, a TEMPORARY CONNEXION with strangers who arrive in the country, IS DEEMED NO DISHONOUR.—"WIVES AND DAUGHTERS are said to be transferred on *easy terms*, and with little scruple. *All affairs of gallantry* seemed, indeed, to be treated by them VERY LIGHTLY."—*(Macartney's Embassy, vol. 1st, page 389.)* "There is no country in the world, where female chastity is so little valued as in the neighbourhood of *Turon:* husbands and fathers, even of considerable rank, *openly bargain with strangers for the use of their wives and their daughters!*" *(Edinburgh Review, vol. 9th, p. 17.)*

But to enter a little more into detail regarding this country, I select from the Edin. Rev. No. 81, the following particulars from White's voyage to it in 1819. "On our approach to the shore," says Capt. W. "our olfactory nerves were saluted with 'the rankest compound of villanous smells that ever offended nostril;' and the natives of the place, consisting of men, women, and children, SWINE *and mangy dogs, equally filthy and miserable* in appearance, lined the muddy banks of this Stygian stream to welcome our landing. With the escort we proceeded

immediately to the house of the Chief, through several defiles, strewed with rotten fish, old bones, and various other nauseous objects, among the fortuitous assemblage of nets, fish pots, old boats, pig-styes, &c. which surrounded us in every direction; and, in order that no circumstance of ceremony should be omitted to honour their new guests, a most harmonious concert was immediately struck up by the swarm of little filthy children, in a STATE OF PERFECT NUDITY (which formed part of our procession) in which they were joined by their parents, THE SWINE and dogs before mentioned." (Rev. p. 125, 126.) "The streets are unpaved, and swarming with pigs and nasty dogs. The inhabitants are disgustingly filthy in their habits and persons, and the whole place out of doors and in, filled with bad smells of every description," (p. 130.) The traders were kept in one place a length of time, merely that the Cochin Chinese might have it in their power to "*beg or steal*" from them. The following quotation gives us an idea of the *paternal* nature of the Government. From the capital to a branch of the Cambodia river, a canal, 28 miles in length, 12 feet deep, and 80 feet wide was cut in six weeks. "Twenty thousand men were employed night and day, by turns, in this stupendous undertaking, and *seven thousand lives* were sacrificed by fatigue and consequent disease," (p. 132.) A mission sent by the Indian Government in 1822, to open up a commercial intercourse with this country, was sent back without effecting the object, and the following quotation from *Mr. White's* book (I quote from the Review) will shew the commercial prospects with this country, their advantages and extent. "The anchorage duties for a brig of 200 tons is upwards of *sixteen hundred dolls.!* To recapitulate the constant villany and turpitude which we experienced from these people, during our residence in the country, would be tedious. Their total want of faith, constant eagerness to deceive and over-reach us; every engine of extortion put in motion, combined with the *rapacious*, *faithless*, *despotic*, and ANTI-COMMERCIAL character of the Government, will, as long as these causes exist, render Cochin China *the least* desirable country for mercantile *adventurers*," (p. 133, 134.) "The Siamese," say the Reviewers, same page, "are still

MORE IMPRACTICABLE than the Cochin Chinese, and *are less* enterprising and industrious."

In his reference to China and India, *Anglus* will be found to be equally partial, disingenuous and incorrect. And first, with regard to the former, I observe, that "the despotism established in China is the most complete and deeply rooted that exists any where on the globe. The CANE, as the *main instrument* of government, is applied, WITHOUT DISTINCTION, to the highest and the lowest Chinese. The female sex are quite excluded from society, and seem generally to be held in very low estimation. Travellers occasionally observed them YOKED IN THE PLOUGH ALONG WITH AN ASS, and bearing the chief part of the labour. The boast of the Chinese is, that China, from the multitude of her varied productions, stands in no need of any foreign commerce. There are NO LARGE FARMS; few families cultivate more than is necessary for their own subsistence, and to enable them to pay THE TAX levied by Government. *Hence nothing is conducted on a large scale.* Their plough is a wretched instrument; and in many places the *spade* and the HOE are the chief means of cultivation."

I consider it unnecessary to go more at length into the subject, to shew the condition of the *free* labourers in China, and the nature of the cultivation carried on, and how carried on by them—I come to the question of sugar cultivation. The quantity raised is in reality limited, and their mode of manufacturing it the most slovenly possible, and very nearly the same as is followed in Hindostan, where it is carried on upon the same trifling scale, and in a similar slovenly manner from want of intellect and capital. The produce is consequently severely injured in the process, and in most cases irretrievably so. "*The Cane plantations* in China belonging to individuals were of VERY LITTLE EXTENT, and the expense of erecting sugar mills too heavy to have *one upon each.*" (Macartney's Embassy, vol. 3d.) The business of extracting the juice and boiling it into sugar is a separate business from cultivating the plant.—The boiler of sugar travels about the country, with a small apparatus sufficient for his purpose: he endeavours to enter into an agreement with several planters at a time, so that his works erected in the centre of their several plantations may

serve them all, without changing his establishment. The West Indies, my Lord, keep certain critics from among them, can have nothing to fear from produce manufactured thus.

But I come closer to the point with *Anglus*. "*As in the West Indies* so in China, the people employed in the field during the season of the sugar crop are observed to get *fat and sleek*, and MANY OF THE CHINESE SLAVES and idle persons are frequently missing about the time the canes become ripe, hiding themselves, and living altogether in the plantations." (*Macartney's Emb. vol. 3d. p.* 293, 294.) Here, my Lord, we have not only "MANY CHINESE SLAVES," but, slaves and the cultivation of sugar, stand identified together as in our West India Colonies. "The canes are planted very regularly in rows, and the earth carefully heaped up about the roots." They are chiefly cultivated on the banks of the river *Chen-tang-chaung*, to the south of *Hon-choo-foo*. So much for Chinese slaves and Chinese sugar, slovenly manufactured and scanty in quantity.

China, my Lord, itself, taken as a whole, presents not an inaccurate picture of slavery in a West India property.—From the sovereign to the lowest subject there is no rank but such as the former creates. Every thing is dependant upon his will, and regulated by his pleasure. His fiat is irrevocable for appointments, orders, occupations, rewards and punishments. All that they have is his, and all that they do is for his benefit, or within his grasp. His slaves, again, possess personal slaves, as negroes do in our Colonies.—There is this difference, and in favour of the West India system, that while the Sovereign of China is accountable to no earthly power or law for his conduct, the West India master is accountable and amenable to the Government—a *British Government*, and all the laws of the country for his conduct. Whatever property the slave earns is secure unto him.

To obtain, however, a more full and correct knowledge of the freedom of China, and the state of the population thereof, I turn to authority which cannot fail to be reverenced by *Anglus*, I mean the Edinburgh Review. In the Review of Barrow's voyage to China, vol. 5th, and *De Guigne's* voyage

to Pekin, the Reviewer states as follows, from the authorities just mentioned.

"What else, indeed, do we know of the Chinese, but their abject submission to a despotism, upheld by the sordid terrors of the LASH—a Government which sentences a first mandarin to be *flogged*, for having given a second mandarin a stripe too few or too many—but the imprisonment and *mutilation* of their women—but their infanticide and *unnatural vices*—but their utter and unconquerable ignorance of all the exacter sciences, and all the branches of natural philosophy—but their total incapacity for the fine arts, and the great imperfection of their knowledge in those that are most necessary—but the stupid formalities which encumber their social intercourse—but the singular imperfection of their language, their cowardice, uncleanliness and *inhumanity*." (vol. 5th, p. 262.) "Two-thirds of the small quantity of land under tillage, says *Barrow*, is cultivated with *the spade or the hoe*, without the aid of draught cattle. The peasants, he says, are almost all crowded into towns and villages, for fear of robbers; and this is the cause of the appearance of extraordinary cultivation in their vicinity. *Nine-tenths* of the peasantry may be considered as cottagers, each renting from the Emperor just as much land as supports his family, and he assures us, that their agriculture is not efficient." (*Rev.* vol. 14th, p. 422, and 423.

"The appearance of the people in the *very best* cultivated parts of the country," Mr. Barrow assures us *is wretched*. "In the dwellings of the first Officers of State, they have no glass in the windows, no stoves, fire places, or fire grates in the rooms; no sofas, bureaux, chandeliers, nor looking-glasses; no book cases, prints, nor paintings. They have neither sheets nor curtains to their beds. Instead of doors, they have usually skreens made of the fibres of the bamboo. The apartments of one of the chief courtiers in the palace of *Gehol*, seemed fitter for the habitation of hogs, than of human beings. The comfort of clean linen, or frequent change of under garments, is equally unknown to the Sovereign and to the peasant. A vest of thin coarse silk, supplies the place of cotton or linen next the skin, among the upper ranks; but the common peo-

ple wear a coarse kind of open cotton cloth. Those vestments are more rarely removed for the purpose of washing, than for that of being replaced with new ones; and the consequence of such neglect or ceremony is, as might naturally be supposed, an abundant increase of *those vermin*, to whose production, filthiness is found to be most favourable. The highest officers of state, make no hesitation of calling their attendants in public, to *seek their necks* for those troublesome animals, which, *when caught, they very composedly* put between their teeth! They sleep at night, in the same clothes they wear by day. Their bodies are as seldom washed, as their articles of dress. The women in the higher ranks, and in the cities, never appear abroad, and *neither eat at the same table, nor sit in the same apartment*, with the male part of the family at home. Their time is chiefly spent in *smoking tobacco!* Every man BUYS his wife from her parents, without seeing her, and may return her, if *he do not like her appearance*, upon paying a certain forfeit: *he may also buy as many as he thinks he can maintain*, AND MAY SELL INTO SLAVERY, as many as he can convict of infidelity. Women can inherit no property. Among the peasantry and the lower ranks, their tyranny takes another shape. There, all the heavy labour falls upon the women; and they may often be seen, WITH AN INFANT ON THEIR BACK, AND HARNESSED WITH AN ASS, *dragging the plough and the harrow*, while the husband indolently directs it, or idles away his time in gambling and smoking."

A Chinese *merchant* will cheat, whenever an opportunity offers him the means, because he is considered to be incapable of acting honestly; a Chinese peasant will steal, whenever he can do it without danger of being detected, because the punishment is only the bamboo, to which he is daily liable. In our return from Peiho, the patience of the superintending officer being exhausted, he ordered his soldiers to *flog the captain and the whole crew*, which was accordingly done in the most unmerciful manner; and this was the only reward for the use of the yacht, *their time* and labour for two days! In the journey of the Dutch Embassy, *M. Van Braam*, assures us that eight of the peasants put in requisition to carry the baggage, *expired under their* burdens in the course of two nights. The Jesuits

reckon, that there are from *two to three* thousand infants exposed every year in the streets of Pekin alone, besides those that are *drowned* in a vessel of warm water at the *moment of birth*, and those that are *thrown* into the rivers, with a gourd tied round their necks, to prolong for a short time, the certainty of their torment, and the chance of their deliverance. Those that are thrown into the streets of the capital, are *tossed into carts in the morning, and thrown altogether, whether dead or alive, into a pit without the walls.* "Such scenes," says Barrow, "were exhibited on those occasions, as to make the feeling mind shudder with horror. When I mention, that dogs and swine are let loose in all the narrow streets of the capital, the reader may conceive *what will sometimes necessarily happen* to the exposed infants, before the police carts can pick them up." No INSTANCE of inhumanity so atrocious, we believe, is to be found in the manners of any other people. With all their domestic rigour, they are ENTIRELY DESTITUTE OF DECENCY OR PURITY. There are multitudes of public women in every town; and *every family is familiar with vices still more detestable.* The Chinese, like other half civilized nations, are addicted to games of chance. They are, in fact, most desperate gamblers, and are often said to *stake their wives and children*, on the hazard of a die. They value their daughters so little, that, when they have more children than they can easily maintain, they hire the midwives to *stifle the females* in a basin of water as soon as they are born, and it is a common practice among them, to SELL THEIR DAUGHTERS, *that they may be brought up as prostitutes!*" (*Edin. Rev.* vol. 5th, pages 267, 269, 271, 272, 273, 274, and 275, and vol. 14th, p. 428.)

FROM China let us turn to India. Aware of the peculiar construction of our empire in India, it is with considerable reluctance, that I state any thing that may appear harsh or severe against it, but when injudicious advocates, or interested individuals, hold it up to admiration and as a contrast to blacken, that they may ruin another quarter of our empire, truth compels me to place the facts of the case, so far as these have a reference

to my subject, fully and fairly before the public. And there, my Lord, it is undisputed that, in reference to civil rights, the whole population—high and low—rich and poor, are political slaves to a foreign nation. The great mass of the middle ranks, are again completely slaves to the higher ranks, and below them again, are what is called the *free* labourers. Let us attend to their situation. In India, the wages of such labourers are about 2d. per day. "At Seringapatam," says Buchanan, "the wages are 6s. 8½d. per month! Six or seven miles from that capital, the hire is 5s. 4d. per month: farther distant, it is still less; and so wretched is their system of agricultural labour, that a field, after six or eight ploughings, has numerous small bushes sticking upright in it, as before the commencement of the ploughing. He is a great farmer who has ONE ACRE of sugar cane to cut in the year—half an acre exceeds the general run of sugar farms. The wages mentioned, are certainly not sufficient to keep soul and body together, and consequently, as Dubois informs us, the free labourers are frequently seen contending with the carrion crows and beasts of prey, for the remains of putrid carcasses, of any description of animals. Such is the state of *free labourers*, in the country over which *Anglus* is Lord, and to which, to use the language his friends have taught me, "we send our soldiers to assist their drivers, and our bayonets to *re-enforce their whips*;" aye, my Lord, "THEIR WHIPS!"* Yet do we ever hear a murmur about their deplorable situation? No! *Anglus* may tell me, *if he can*, how many manufactured goods, a miserable Hindoo labourer can afford to buy and to pay for, out of such a pittance. These labourers, according to Buchanan, are severely flogged for offences and dereliction of duty. That they are compelled, by the lash to work, can scarcely be doubted, when their masters, as Dow informs us, are whipped in their turn by their superiors.

* It is their Constitutional right, it seems, to treat more than half a million of human beings, born or living under the King's allegiance, with what severity and cruelty they please. It is our *duty*, no doubt, on the other hand, implicitly to abet them in their oppressions. We must uphold and protect them, in the exercise of a system, which we have no right to regulate or control, *sending our soldiers when necessary, to assist their drivers, and our bayonets*, to re-enforce their whips!" (*Stephen's Defence Registry*, 1816, *Letter* 1st. p. 16.)

"The CRUELTY of the farmers to their INFERIORS," says he, "recoiled at length upon themselves. MANY OF THEM WERE BOUND TO STAKES, and whipped; but their poverty ceased to be feigned. Their complaints were heard in every square in *Moorshedabad*, and NOT A FEW OF THEM EXPIRED UNDER THE LASH." The West India slave is not yet reduced so low, as to be compelled to work for masters like these.

"The agriculture of the Hindoos," says the Edin. Rev. vol. 4th, p. 319—323, and vol. 13, p. 95, is wretched in the extreme. The rudeness of their implements, the slovenliness of their practice, and their total ignorance of the most simple principles of the science, are equally remarkable. The husbandry of the south of Europe is bad; but when compared to that of India, is perfection. No traces of former superiority are displayed in the husbandry of India, and we can without difficulty, perceive in their tools the resemblance of those which were in use two thousand years ago. In some instances it is necessary to plough the field *fifteen times* over in every direction, before it is fit for sowing. The Zemindar raises his rent according to the produce of the year. The interest of the Lessee is merely annual. His condition *is wretched in the extreme*, and it appears that this class is the most indigent of all the natives of Bengal. The common people are *universally miserably poor*, and in many places, extremely filthy and slovenly,—OVERRUN WITH VERMIN AND CONSUMED WITH ITCH. The huts of the peasants are universally built with mud, without windows or chimnies. In the district about Allahabad, the whole stock of the farmer is not worth 8 *rupees*, (20/,) exclusive of the value of his cattle. Wheat is only used by the higher ranks. The most substantial meat to which the lower ranks can aspire, is a sort of porridge of fried *grain*, reduced to flour by a hand mill."

But multitudes of the labourers in India, my Lord, are in reality personal hereditary slaves to classes of society such as have been mentioned. *(Buchanan.)* Forbes informs us that mothers sell their daughters for a rupee, and the trade of purchasing girls for prostitution is common in India. The state of slavery in India was last Session moved for by Mr.

Buxton, but I have not yet heard that it has been produced! These personal slaves, however, are not the most wretched of the Hindoo population, nor more slaves than at least TWENTY-TWO MILLIONS of *Sudras*, the inferior or labouring Castes in India, are. By the Hindoo laws, these are irrevocably fixed in the rank of society to which they are reduced. From generation to generation they remain the same. They cannot move from their degraded rank, nor rise above it. The West India slave may be emancipated, instructed—is emancipated and instructed, but an Indian *Sudrah* can, not only neither be instructed nor emancipated, but the loss of Caste and the most terrible denunciations of punishments and vengeance here and hereafter, are denounced by the Hindoo laws against any who may make such an attempt.

On the subject of Slavery in the East Indies, however, which is but little known in this Country, and strictly concealed by *Anglus* and his friends; it is requisite to be a little more particular. "*The lower classes in India are* SLAVES TO SLAVES," says Mills. "*Girls are sold for the purpose of prostitution*," said Mr. Trant, East India House, July 25th, 1822. "In the Lower CARNATIC, the farms are *chiefly* cultivated, by Slaves of the inferior Castes."—(Buch. vol. 1. p. 19.) In districts of Malabar "by far the greater part of the labour in the field is performed by SLAVES or *Charmur*. These are the absolute property of their *Devarus* or Lords. They are not attached to the soil, but transferred in any manner their masters think fit. The Slaves are very severely treated; and their diminutive stature and squalid appearance, shew evidently a want of adequate nourishment. *There can be no comparison between their condition, and that of the Slaves in the West India Colonies.* The labour of females is always exacted by their husbands' master; the master of the girl, having no authority over her as long as she lives with another man's Slave." (Buch. vol. 2. p. 370—372.)" In CUNUMBARA NADA, almost all the farmers have Slaves. In TULAVA, there are also some bought men or slaves. The *Covar* or *Coriavar*, once masters of TULAVA, are now all Slaves. In the Northern parts of TULAVA, are two *Castes*, both of whom are Slaves. In HAIGA, in the farms of the Brahmins, most of the labour is performed by Slaves. In BIDDEVARA, there are a good many Slaves. In one district of MALABAR, out of a population of 95,499, there are 16,574 Slaves. In KHIRAKUM BURANO, KHARAKUM BURAM, and PORAWAY, there are 4,765. In CANAMORE and CHERICAL, there are 4,600 Slaves. At MANUPURAM, a Slave when thirty years old, costs 100 fanams, or £2 11 14 11 7. In SOONDAH, men Slaves receive an yearly allowance of rice, clothes, and money equal to £2 11 8 11 7½: but the women only 8/1. When a man's stock of Cows is large, they are kept with the labouring Cattle in a house, but at *some distance* from the abode of *freemen*, in a place where Slaves are *permitted to dwell*, when the Crop is *not* on the ground, for these poor creatures are considered as TOO

IMPURE to be permitted to approach the house of their *Devaru*, or Lord. (Buch. vol. ii. p. 3, 56, 243, 406, 407, 485, 491, 495: and vol. iii. p. 35, 100, 106, 148, 243, 280, and 380.) The hired labourers are subjected to the *Lash*, at the pleasure of their masters. The PARIAHS, are great drunkards, and when in that state, often treat their female Slaves with great cruelty, even when they are pregnant. (*Du Bois.*) Slavery, says Mr. Wilberforce, H. Com. March 19th, 1823, has existed in India, from time immemorial. There she has taken up her abode, and made unto herself a nest, &c. *

Besides vices peculiar to the Hindoos, there is not a vice which can be named, and which is known in the West Indies, but what is practised in India to a greater degree. It is not a little remarkable, and amusing to hear *Anglus* and other East India Proprietors, complaining of and lamenting over the immorality which prevails in the West India Colonies, from the connexions formed without marriage between the black and mulatto females, and the white males, while that same intercourse is carried on in India equally openly, and to a much greater extent. Every writer upon Indian affairs dwells upon this point, and proclaims the danger which menaces our Empire in the East, from the prevalence of the practice, which, says the *Edin. Rev.* vol. 4th, p. 326, "contributes to the production of an intermediate class of inhabitants, who have neither the education or virtues of their European parents, and who, by the constitution of our Indian Government, are prevented from holding any situation under the Company. The number at present of these is estimated to *exceed a million*," and it is well known that it was officers from this class, who disciplined and led on to action the troops of Scindea. The immoral incestuous connexions of the females amongst the tribe named *Nairs* are well known. These are unlimited and gloried in, in fact held as an honour.

Such, my Lord, and from unquestionable authority, is the situation of the *free* labourers, and of the SLAVES in India, the

* "There was this to be said with respect to Slavery in the East—there the principle had been established for centuries. Slavery had formed its nest, hedged round with the strong mounds and bulwarks raised by superstition, by cunning, and inveterate custom. There were evils they could not immediately remedy in the East, evils which they knew from history, had existed for 2000 years. For them they were not accountable; they had not caused them."

product of whose labour is called the product of free labour, and whose condition is constantly brought forward as a contrast by interest, prejudice and malevolence, against the state of the slaves in the West Indies. It is abundantly obvious, my Lord, that *Anglus* has sufficient evils and enormities to reform and remove in his own principality—his own dominions, without interfering with his neighbours, and we cannot help *blushing* for that hypocrisy which turns up its nose and its eyes at West India slavery, whose hand, at the same moment is twisting the chain, to the last stretch, round the neck of the trembling Hindoo!

The inequality of the duty in England, my Lord, can have no reference whatever to the price of sugar in England purchased for foreign markets, where each stands upon a footing of equality, and where equal quality will bear an equal price. Upon reference to Prince's Price Current of Nov. 26th, the prices of the different sugars at market stood thus:—

	Aver. Brown.	Aver. Best.	Gen. Aver.
West Indian, ...	27s.	40s.	32s.
East Indian, ...	19s.	33s. 6d.	26s.
Havannah, ...	25s.	37s.	30s.
Siam and China, ...	25s.	28s.	27s.
Java, ...	21s.	28s.	24s.
Brazil, ...	22s. 6d.	32s.	26s. 6d.
Bourbon, ...	20s. 6d.	23s.	21s.

From these references it appears that Brazil sugar produced by slave labour is equally cheap as East Indian Sugar produced by free labour, if *Anglus* will have it so, and Havannah higher in price, because it is vastly superior in quality, and West India sugar, from the same reason, superior to all the others. Were this not the case, East India Sugar would command the European continental market, to the exclusion of all others, but which experience teaches us is not the fact. The Brazil and Havannah, in particular, overwhelm and beat it out of every market. As in West India sugar, so in East India sugar, upon exportation to foreign parts, if *refined*, the *whole* duty is drawn back, and 3s. per cwt. more than the present duty, which acts as a bounty. Nothing, therefore, hinders the refiners to use the latter for the foreign market, but the high prices and inferior quality.

The last No. of the Edinburgh Review settles these points. In bringing forward an anticolonial pamphlet (which I have not yet seen) the Review designates it "An enquiry respecting the means of IMPROVING THE QUALITY, and REDUCING THE COST of sugar raised by *free labour* in the EAST INDIES." So, my Lord, after all the bravadoes of the critic and his anticolonial friends, the truth is at last acknowledged, namely, that East India Sugar is high in price, and very inferior in quality!

But, farther, the question of the cheapness of East India sugar over all others, is, I conceive, my Lord, set at rest for ever by the appeal made to the nation in its favour by the anti-slavery society in their last publication, ushered into the world by *Hutchard & Son*, wherein they tell us that "no *low priced Brown Sugar* comes from India at a *lower price than* 8*d. per lb.*" which, deducting the East India duty, 37s. per cwt. leaves 4d. per lb. as first cost, higher by 1d. than Brown West India Sugar of a superior quality. The Society also cautions the purchaser from dealing with shopkeepers who mix the East India sugar, that is add to it a *cheaper and better West Indian Sugar* to give them more profit from the credulous dupes. Volumes wrote on this subject could not expose in stronger colours the falsity of all the previous anticolonial statements than is done by this appeal or address.

But, my Lord, the proper way to judge of the comparative price of East India and West India sugar, is to take the price of the former as it stands in Calcutta, and contrast that with the price of West India sugar in the London market, at a period of any given year, allowing for the distance between England and India, so that in the latter country, they could know the state of the market in the former. The latest official returns to enable me to do this, which I have seen, are those contained in the East India official report, published December, 1822. The rates stand thus:—

4th App. p. 12.	Aver. W. In. sugar, Lond. Gazette for 4 months, ending Jan. 5th, 1821, ...	£1 ‖ 12 ‖ 5½
Do. do. p. 36.	Aver. E. In. sugar, Calcutta, May 6th, Best sort, ...	£1 ‖ 12 ‖ 0¼
Do. do.	Do. do. Second sort, ...	£1 ‖ 8 ‖ 10½

From which it appears, that West Indian sugar in the London market, and including all charges, was only 2/, per cwt. higher than East Indian sugar, *exclusive* of all charges, in the Calcutta market.*

The deceptions spread over this country regarding the East India Sugar Trade, are scarcely credible; but after the Official Report, published December 1822, by the East India Company, it never could have been supposed that any one connected with the East Indies, would have written and spoken about it as they have done. It is well known that the Company expended large sums of money to raise Sugar in India for exportation, and also to cultivate it after the West India manner; but it is equally well known and acknowledged, that all their efforts proved fruitless. Sugar and saltpetre were principally brought from India as dead weight, or in place of ballast, and yet even brought in this way, the former was sold at a loss. To place this matter in a conspicuous point of view before the Public, I quote the following Extracts from the Commercial Correspondence of the East India Company, (speaking as merchants,) contained in the Report just alluded to. *Second Appendix, pages* 16—21.

"We have regularly advised our Governor-General in Council, that such quantity of Sugar may be provided, as, with the regular investment of Saltpetre, should be sufficient to furnish DEAD WEIGHT for all the ships which we might despatch to the several Presidencies of India, to be returned with cargoes to Europe. But as such supply of Sugar for dead weight is attended with a CONSIDERABLE LOSS, it is indispensably necessary, that none but Sugars of the finer assortments should be laden. In the margin,† we have quoted the prices at which great part of the

* While the above was in types, I received a Calcutta Price Current of the 19th August last, from which I make the following quotations:—

	Rup.
Sugar Benares, ...	8 14 a 9
Ditto. do. 2d quality, ...	8 8 a 8 12
Ditto, old, 1st ditto, ...	7 8 a 7 12
Ditto, do. 2d do.	6 12 a 7

Strong grained—None.

Per *maund* of 82 lbs. or from 22/ to 29/ per cwt.

† Rungpore Chenee, 30/6 Mow and Assinghur, 54/6 to 55/6
Benares Chenee, 27/ to 34/6 Do. 39/6
Santipore Chenee, 30/6 to 34/ Do. 46/
Birkenpore, 33/6 to 37/6 Benares Chenee, 43/6
Rungpore, 25/ to 29/ Do. 35/
Do. 61/

last importation of Sugar has been sold; from which it will appear, that our injunctions as to quality, have not been so fully attended to as the case requires, some of the Sugar not having obtained *a price more than sufficient to defray the expense of freight and charges.*" (Letter to Bengal, 19th August, 1807.) June 20th, 1810, they write, "It is only in time of peace, that the importation of Sugar from India can become considerable, *the high freight*, even of Indian or extra ships, from that *distant country*, during war, giving the Sugar of the West Indies a decided advantage; and upon general considerations, we are not desirous of carrying on trade in this commodity to any extent, BEYOND THE NECESSITY OF BALLASTING OUR SHIPS." On the 29th of June, they write: "Should you find it necessary or convenient to transmit to us any Sugar, it must exclusively consist of the finest and whitest assortments, such as the *Mow* and *Auringhur*; and if any of the lower quality should have been provided in the usual course of your investment, it may be sold in Calcutta, if it can be disposed of without loss." On the 14th January, 1811, they write: "The Sugar which you may have on hand, may be *sold* in India, and we trust a *considerable profit* will be derived from a consignment thereof TO BOMBAY!!" On the 11th September, 1811, they write: "We have now to observe, that the reasons which induced the Company to engage in this trade *(Sugar)* have ceased; and, therefore, it is expedient, as well on *general principles*, as on account of the LOSS which has attended it, that Sugar should not form part of the Company's investment, except for such quantity, and that of the finer assortments only, as may be wanted in addition to the annual provision of Saltpetre, for supplying our ships with the quantity of *dead weight* which may have been stipulated." On the 15th August, 1821, they write, communicating the Act of Parliament, laying an additional duty of *5s.* per cwt. on Sugar imported from the East Indies, "IF CLAYED, or so refined, as to resemble the sort usually denominated Clayed;" and add, "but that on the Brown or Muscovado Sugar, of which the consignments from our East India possessions have hitherto principally consisted, the duty remains as at present. On Sugars, both Clayed and Muscovado, the produce of China, Java, or any other Country in the East Indies, except the British territories, the duty has been increased to an amount that will totally exclude it from consumption in this country. From this MARKED PREFERENCE IN FAVOUR of the produce of Bengal and other British possessions, it becomes of the greatest importance, that all Sugar shipped, either on account of the Company, or of Private Merchants, should be accompanied with the *Certificate of Origin*, required by the 6th Clause of the said Act," &c.

Pages might be filled with references similar to the above, but it is deemed unnecessary. And if such was the state of the East India Sugar trade in 1810, when the Continent of Europe took off 100,000 hhds. from our market, and no foreign Colonial produce in quantity sufficient to beat down the price was to be found, what must it now be, when the Continent does not take 35,000 hhds. from us, and every Continental port is glutted with foreign Colonial produce? The question is easily answered.

For the further elucidation of this subject, I shall here add from the East India Official Report, the quantity of Sugar imported *into*, and exported from India to all places, for the years 1819—20, the latest for which the return is given. (See *E. I. Rep.* 4th App. page 64, 65, and 72, 73.)

Imported from,	Value Rupees.
China,	20,07,449
Penang, Eastward,	1,86,931
All other places,	99,607
Total,	22,93,987
At 2/ each,	£229,398

Price about 25/ per cwt.

Exported to,	Value Rupees.
Arabian and Persian Gulfs,	7,87,660
North America,	15,12,659
Great Britain,	22,48,042
All other places,	6,88,492
Total,	52,36,853
At 2/ each,	£523,683

Price 34/ per cwt.

A few figures from official returns, are worth volumes of assertion and declamation. Accordingly, the same Report, App. 4th, page 46, in the account of the external Commerce of Bengal, after considering the subject most minutely, adds:—

"The fact is so obvious, that almost every shipment of Sugar made from Bengal to the United Kingdom, since the year 1816, HAS BEEN A LOSING ONE; AND THAT IT HAS BEEN EQUALLY SO TO FRANCE, HOLLAND, &c. is evident from the small number of ships of those nations, that have frequented this port; and in fact, *the trade in Sugar* from Bengal to Europe, *can never be an extensive one, until there is a material reduction in the price here*. It has been said, and very generally admitted, that if the West India Planter receives 20/ per cwt. for his Sugar, with an average crop, he is able to cultivate to some advantage; this price is barely equal to six *rupees* per maund, while the West India Sugar is *superior*, as well for consumption in *its unrefined state, as for manufacture*. It is likewise subject to much less charge for freight, &c. so that the East India Sugar *must be sold for about half its present price*, before it can form a very important article of trade to Europe. As long as the price of Sugar continues as high here, it cannot be a considerable article of trade to England, *even if the duties were equalized:* and, in doing so, the British Government would *cause a serious injury to the West India Planter, while they would not produce an increasing importation of Sugar from Bengal!*" All further elucidation and argument upon this subject would be superfluous. *

* CANARA is a district in Hindostan, in which Sugar is produced. In the *Christian Instructor* for December, there is a classification of the inhabitants, said to be Roman Catholics, according to the professions in which they are engaged. The total number is 654,121. Of these, 378,644 are Husbandmen; 45,626 are

Anglus must really conceive the people of this country to be ill informed indeed, before he could venture to advance the monstrous assertion, that any Colonial produce, more especially sugar, the most laborious of the whole, was entirely the production of free labour in the countries noticed in my preceding letter. Perhaps *Anglus* considers these countries as free, merely because they are included within the great monopoly Charter of the East India Company, of which he is an active member, and excluded from all connexion or communication from every other British subject, except such as the East India monopolists, of which he is one, permit and sanction. What claims to civilization and freedom, personal or national, these countries possess, I leave him at his leisure to explain. They are not quite so brutalized as South Western Africa, and stand rather superior in political knowledge and industry to Sierra Leone, and that is the most that can be said of them, which, God knows, is saying little in their favour indeed.

In not one single thing that *Anglus* touches or brings forward on these subjects, is he correct, or does he state fairly the point at issue. While the purest despotism, and grossest superstition and most grievous oppression prevail without shame, reproach, or control in the countries he would push into notice as FREE, PERSONAL SLAVERY exists to a great extent in them all, and is recognised by the laws of every one of these countries. It is dealing most dishonestly, my Lord, with the public, to conceal these facts, and because there are, what *Anglus* may if he chooses, designate *free labourers*, in these countries, to state, or leave it to be supposed, that the produce of these countries, was the exclusive product of free labour. The line of conduct pursued by him on this subject, is as disingenuous, as it would be on my part to state, that the produce of the West Indies is the product of *free labour*, because there are a number of free people there, but omitting at the same time to

drawers of toddy from the palm tree; 94,907 are Porters or bearers of burthens; 25,828 are Traders; 22,397 are Milksellers; and 916 SUGAR MANUFACTURERS, thus shewing how trifling the Sugar trade of India is, when compared with any other branch of industry.

state, that slaves were numerous, and their labour actively and chiefly employed.

Of the prospects of a safe, beneficial, commercial intercourse with those quarters of the world to which *Anglus* wishes us to direct our attention, after the abandonment of our own flesh and blood to the fury of the semi-savages, I cannot do better than quote the words of his friend the Edinburgh Critic, to show its impracticability, or, at any rate, inutility.

"There is nothing more remarkable in the accounts which we have of all the different nations whose coasts are washed by the China seas, than the *pertinacity* with *which every kind of* FOREIGN INTERCOURSE IS RESISTED. It matters not whether this intercourse be favourable to the natives or otherwise—whether its object be commerce or curiosity—or the necessity of obtaining supplies. EVERY THING FOREIGN IS CONSIDERED AS HOSTILE, AND IS TREATED AS SUCH—that is to say, is got rid of as speedily as possible. This *characteristic feature* becomes more and more marked *as we go Eastward.* In Cochin China, Europeans are indeed admitted—but they are *cheated, insulted, and thwarted* in ALL their views, in a manner which has no example IN THE WEST. In China, Heaven knows, we have work enough to maintain our footing; and nothing but the most urgent necessities of that state prevents our being *ousted at once.* The people of Loo Choo have a particular liking for the departure of all strangers, and the *climax* of this inhospitable spirit winds up in *Japan*, where it is the ESTABLISHED PRACTICE to CRUCIFY ALL STRANGERS, *pour les encourager les autres!!*"—(*Rev.* No. 81, p. 135, 136.)

Such, my Lord, is *the religion, the morality, the freedom, the* SUPERIOR HUMANITY, *and the happiness*, of the people from whom *Anglus* insists we shall take sugar. Countries, my Lord, wherein, notwithstanding all the whining and *tender regard*, which himself and his friends express about the female sex, we find they are degraded to the lowest possible rank, that polygamy is universal, and the "marriage tie" UNKNOWN, and where the whole labour is laid upon the shoulders of those unhappy FEMALES, slaves to the pleasures, and drudges to the power of male barbarians. Yet *Anglus* exults at the prospect, and con-

templates with joy their being at an early day, set to work *harder, to drag the plough and the harrow, harnessed with asses,* and with their infants tied to their backs, and DRIVEN by their unfeeling indolent lords, in order to produce *more* sugar in the pestilential swamps of Siam and Cochin China!

It is obvious, therefore, my Lord, to the most careless observer, that the destruction and abandonment of our West India Colonies, by increasing the demand for sugar from the countries which we have been considering, would only add to the torments, oppressions, and punishments, under which the population, free and bond, of these countries, already groan, and be the means of enabling a set of ignorant, ferocious despots, to wallow in deeper and more disgraceful dissipation, by supplying them with the means and the treasure to accomplish their end. Unless *Anglus* could import sugar, coffee, &c. from Abyssinia, Dahomey and Ashantee, or from PANDEMONIUM itself, I scarcely know any other quarter from which he could import these things, where greater immorality, superstition, despotism, ignorance, SLAVERY, and oppression prevail, than in the countries just mentioned, and which he recommends so strongly and so feelingly, to our consideration, and our friendship, and our support.

The anticolonists, my Lord, cannot and do not attempt to deny, that sugar is produced in the West Indies, in greater abundance than in their favourite corners, in proportion to the number of labourers. The reason, or rather the assertion which they bring forward for this superior production, is *compulsory labour*, and the excess of cruelty and oppression. When common sense, however, is attended to, it is obvious, that every such Government destroys its own ends. The plain, simple, and obvious reason, my Lord, for the superior abundance, the superiority in quality, and quantity of West India sugar, is because it is cultivated and manufactured under the direction of superior intellect, and abundant capital; and till *Anglus*, for his own worldly ends, began to torment them, also with unlimited credit. This is the plain fact, and simple explanation of West India superiority over Africa, America, India, Java, Siam, Cochin China, and China, where all these necessary

supports and sinews of agriculture, are either miserably deficient, or altogether wanting.

In this, my Lord, there is nothing strange. Similar causes produce similar results in every part of the world. Look at the corn trade. The *villeins* of Poland and Russia in Europe, amidst plenty for their own country, produce corn cheaper than can be produced in this country. There, the efforts of hundreds of rude people, combined under the capital and direction of one man, produce more than the aggregate produce of each individual isolated could, and while under the former state they produce abundance for themselves, wealth for their master and employer, and resources to the state, it is almost certain that their isolated, unsupported exertions, like the barbarians of Siberia, would not prove sufficient to support themselves. Five hundred individuals, employed by one man of capital and credit in a manufactory in this country, will make wealth for him, and good wages for themselves; whereas, left to themselves, and without capital, they probably would not have where to lay their heads. It is their combined efforts put in motion, and kept in motion by his intelligence and capital, which produces great results. In like manner it is with the slaves in our Colonies under intelligent and opulent masters. They produce plenty to themselves—in prosperous times, wealth to him—and great resources to the State. If left to themselves, they have neither the means nor the credit, even if they had the will, and the intelligence to produce even a sufficiency for themselves.

In the Temperate Zones, my Lord, the great majority of mankind labour from the conviction that it is their duty, as they feel it adds to their wealth, to do so. In the Torrid Zone it is directly the reverse. There the great majority of mankind will not labour beyond what supplies the scantiest wants which savage life requires, unless they are compelled to act otherwise. Amongst the negroes, in the Tropical regions of Africa, this is the case to a greater degree than amongst any other race of mankind in the Equatorial regions of the globe. But, my Lord, there is scarce a country in the

world (I may say there is none) where a portion of mankind are not found who require compulsion to make them work.

Nor is this indolence and aversion to labour, particularly agricultural labour, confined to the Africans who are in a state of nature, and the liberated negroes, as they are called, in Sierra Leone. It is equally conspicuous in differently and better regulated settlements in that continent. Thus in the new American settlement on the African coast, not far from Sierra Leone, the officer superintending it *(J. Ashmun,)* in a letter to the Society which employs him, and dated Aug. 5th, 1824, while he points out what should be done and what could be done, adds, "If THE EXTREME RELUCTANCE of the settlers to engage heartily in *agricultural labours* can by *any possibility be overcome.*"

It is as impossible to get *Anglus* in his anticolonial lucubrations to adhere to fact, as it is to expect a cloudless sky with a southern storm in the month of November. "Let those," says he, *New Times*, Sept. 10, "who have tried the compulsory labours of convicts in New South Wales, or of parish paupers in England, be consulted, and their report, will uniformly be, that they would prefer paying high wages to the free labourers, rather than be forced to employ, for his bare food and clothing, the convict or the pauper who DERIVES NO BENEFIT FROM HIS EXERTIONS." There are, then it seems, my Lord, men in England, who, though free, "derive no benefit from their exertions!" Now, my Lord, either this statement put forward by *Anglus*, is altogether wrong regarding parish paupers in England, or the Reports of the House of Commons, printed last Session of Parliament are so. Those, and indeed every other authority, inform us, that these wretched beings called parish paupers, "*white—free Englishmen*"—males and females, are every Monday morning marshalled in bands or gangs, put up to auction, and sold to the farmers, the highest bidders (price 3s. 6d. to 4s. 6d. per week) who are most eager to buy, because they get them at a much lower rate than they can obtain the independent free labourer, and also and chiefly, because they have no interest in the fate of the wretched creatures, their health, protection or preservation—but merely to make as

much work out of them as they can, in a given time, the parish making good the additional sum, which is necessary to keep them in clothes and food—in existence. The great reduction of wages which this system occasions to the independent free labourer, and the avidity with which the farmers in England resort to it, is perfectly notorious—engages at this moment the attention of the Legislature, as an enormous and dangerous evil, and yet *Anglus*, in support of his theory, has the hardihood to state what is directly the reverse of the fact.

Dr. HUNT in his evidence says, that the Pauper labourers, in Bedfordshire, are ranged in a row LIKE SO MANY SHEEP OR BLACK CATTLE every Monday morning, and put up by the overseer to be sold as labourers to the farmers, who bid for them according to their estimation of their *sinews and strength*. The Report of the Select Committee says, in the Counties of Bedford, Hampshire, Norfolk, Sussex, and Suffolk, "crime, advances with increasing boldness and these counties are, in spite of our gaols and our laws, filled with poachers and thieves. The weekly allowances of the paupers cannot supply more than food. How, then, are clothing, firing, and rent to be provided? by robbery and plunder, &c."

Even in England, therefore, amongst paupers, we perceive that compulsory labour is the order of the day. According to *Par. Return, No.* 357, of 1824, they are sent to prison and to houses of correction if they refuse to work, and to prison if they do not attend the hours prescribed for work. Thousands of references might be adduced from that single report, 124 folio pages of which, are filled with names of delinquents of this description, and to shew the general features of the whole, I select at random from page 60 the following:—"*Thomas Yates*, REFUSING TO WORK IN A PROPER MANNER, and to come to his work in a proper time, when chargeable to the parish. *William Howard*, idle and disorderly, refusing to work, by his wilful neglect becoming chargeable to the parish. *John Hudson*, REFUSING TO WORK for proper wages, whereby he and his family became chargeable to the parish. (page 69.)—*Anthony Smith*, FOUND LYING IN A DITCH, and no visible means of obtaining a livelihood. *Jonathan Wright*, found lodging in the open air, and not giving a good account of

himself." Here, my Lord, is compulsory labour. Imprisonment and public hard labour can be resorted to in this country to enforce work, because only the culprit suffers, but it is evident to every human being (*Anglus* excepted) that such a mode of punishment cannot with justice be adopted in the West Indies, or indeed in any other place where the labour is carried on by slaves, because by imprisoning his slave for not working, the master only punishes himself by depriving himself of the slave's labour, which he cannot otherwise replace, as farmers and others can replace labour in this country.

There is this difference also, my Lord, in West India punishment and apprehension of black vagrants, and the punishment and apprehension of white vagrants, that the latter are seized upon, and imprisoned and punished for being found wandering in, and lying out in the open air, or "*in a ditch*,"—because they have neither house nor home, friends nor funds—nor a spot whereon to lay their heads; while the former are apprehended and lodged in prison, because they have not only a house and a home, but supplies and clothing and food, but will not stay with them and enjoy them.

The real question at issue, in the Colonial discussion, when tried by the principles which anticolonists urge and recommend, is, are we to have Sugar Colonies, or are we not? Are we to continue to import nearly NINE MILLIONS sterling from the West Indies, and export five millions thereto—employ 800 ships, 16,000 seamen, and 222,000 tons of shipping in that trade, or are these imports and exports to be wholly cut off, and the trade annihilated? Destroy the master's authority, my Lord, (it is already fearfully shaken) and we could not retain the sovereignty of these Colonies a day, but at an expense greater than the outlay which maintained the Peninsular war, and carried our arms to Paris. Under such circumstances, the United States, in defiance of our power and our capital, would reap every advantage in trade which could be derived from these possessions—we should strike off FIFTEEN MILLIONS sterling from our annual exports and imports, and add 12 millions of dollars to theirs—strike off 18,000 seamen and 220,000 tons shipping from our trade, and add probably half

that number to theirs! All the arguments in the brains of a thousand speculators, and ten thousand metaphysicians, cannot alter these facts, nor arrest their fatal consequences. The anticolonists continually tell us, look what St. Domingo is doing because she is FREE! But, my Lord, their thoughtless heads overlook the fact, that when the negroes in St. Domingo had destroyed their masters and seized their properties, they next revolted against France—stand now in open rebellion against her. Our Colonies would act a similar part. Adopt the counsels of *Anglus*, my Lord, and a short, a very short period indeed, would bring round these fatal results.

Negro emancipation, by positive law is, my Lord, the destruction of our Sugar Colonies. Foreign and rival nations, are well convinced of that fact. "Talleyrand," says the *Edin. Rev.* vol. 6th, p. 69, "asserts as a truth beyond all dispute, that sooner or later, the *emancipation of the Negroes, must overthrow the cultivation of the Sugar Colonies.*" And looking at the same subject, the Review, vol. 8th, p. 64, says, "No change of dynasty, can new make, or new mould, half a million of men; convert slaves into freemen, or force a *rude* multitude, into a community of civilized subjects; and, when were mere barbarians, ever peaceful?" And says the Reviewer, *(Mr. Brougham)* in another place, vol. 6th, p. 341. "Whether all the mischief of Negro liberty comes at once, and falls upon the system with an instantaneous shock, or *only undermines it gradually*, and then covers it with ruin in the end, we need scarcely take the pains to inquire: the alternative is almost equal.—The fate of a large Empire, with all its wealth and power, depends upon the result of the "present" discussion. The Colonial establishments of the European States in the New World, form a mass of dominion, scarcely inferior in magnitude, to the proudest dynasties of ancient or modern times; and though their ruin would not necessarily involve that of the Mother Countries, it would completely subvert all the established relations between the different members of the European commonwealth, besides *producing a vast absolute diminution in the* PROSPERITY OF THE OLD WORLD!"

But, my Lord, Talleyrand went much further than the Reviewer has thought proper to state. He contemplated not only

the ruin of our Colonies, but the restoration and establishment of Colonies to France. For this purpose, Egypt was invaded by France, and from what the present Mahommedan ruler of that country is effecting in it, we may judge what would have been effected, had Egypt remained in the hands of a nation so mighty and so enterprising as France certainly is. The French Government sought Colonial possessions, as the only means that could enable France to reach the heart of her great rival, *Great Britain*. Her Colonies, said Talleyrand to the Consular Government, are her sheet anchor—the support of her navy—the fortress of her power. Render these useless, or deprive her of them, said he, "AND YOU BREAK DOWN HER LAST WALL; YOU FILL UP HER LAST MOAT!"

It is not denied that sugar has become a necessary of life to the people of Great Britain, and that they cannot, and will not want it, while it can be obtained. The question that again recurs, is simply this: Shall they, in all its stages of manufacture, &c. obtain sugar by means of the capital and industry of Foreign States, or by their own capital and industry? In reply *Anglus* says, YES! but your Lordship, and every true British Statesman will, I am convinced, say No!

But, my Lord, we are coolly told by these East India speculators, that suppose we got no sugar from our West India Colonies, we should get abundance from various other quarters, and at a cheaper rate. I deny the assertion, and proceed to expose the assumption. The quantity of sugar exported from every country which produces it, to every country west of the Bay of Bengal, stands thus:—

From the British West India Colonies,	...	...	190,000 Tons.
... India, ...			20,000
... Eastern Isles, ...			16,000
... Brazils and Cuba equal to Muscovado,		...	140,000
Total,		...	366,000
Consumed in Britain, ... 150,000			
... Europe and United States, 216,000			366,000 Tons.

Now, my Lord, it is obvious to any thing but obstinacy, and prejudice the most blind, that if we strike away from the market, as by the emancipation of the slaves in our Colonies, we would strike away, 190,000 tons, *(above one-half)* that, in the first

place, the deficiency could not be supplied from any quarter; in the second place, that such a deficiency would triple the prime cost; in the third place, that the sugar consumed, would almost exclusively be Foreign sugar, and not merely Foreign sugar, but sugar raised by slave labour, and, moreover, chiefly brought to this country in Foreign ships. Let *Anglus*, if he can, refute these important facts.*

But, say the anticolonists, though they are rather shy on this point, the increased demand, will produce increased exertions to procure an adequate supply. I say no, my Lord, except it is from an increased exertion by slave labour, and the slave trade in various countries in the world; and this brings me to consider more minutely, the question of *free labour* and slave labour, as applied to what is technically called Colonial produce, (sugar, coffee, &c.) within the Tropics, and as it is applied in argument to the decision of the great question now before the public.

When the European sugar market was stripped of almost one-half its supply, by the revolution in St. Domingo, and sugar rose to an enormous price, the East India Company, with all the force of their capital and their authority—by free

* The boasts that are made in this country about the quantity of sugar in the Eastern quarter of the world, more especially for exportation to the Western World, are so numerous and loud, that it is of importance to examine the subject minutely, and shew its extent and details. The following particulars, will bring us near the truth:

			Disposable.
India, *Imported* from all parts, ...	22,000,000 lbs.		
... *Exported*, do. do. ...	34,000,000 ...		
			12,000,000
Siam, *Export*, See Crawford's Mission,	80,000 *peculs*. ...		10,000,000
Java, *Made* in 1818, (*Crawford*) ...	242,857 *Cwts*. ...		27,200,000
China, *Imports* from Cochin China, (*Macartney's Embassy*,) ...	40,000 *tons*.	89,600,000	
... *Exports* to India, ...	20,000,000 ...		
do. to Japan, (*Dutch Embassy*,)	12,500,000 ...	32,500,000	
Excess Import over Export, consumed in China,		57,100,000	
	Total Disposable, ...		49,200,000

Of this also, part is exported into China, from Java, and Siam. But taking it as it stands, it is less than the produce of the two British Colonies, St. Vincents, and Grenada!

labour, and by slave labour—by every possible effort, scheme, and way, tried to increase the cultivation and export of sugar from India, but, the utmost they could bring forward for exportation to Europe, after three years' labour, and immense outlays of money, was only 8000 tons! and part of this was procured for the European market, by taking it from the markets in the Persian and Arabian Gulfs, by which these markets have, in a great measure, ever since, been thrown into the hands of foreigners for their supply. I appeal to the official report, published by the East India Company, December 1822, for the truth of what I now advance, and I call upon *Anglus*, and challenge him to refute the facts. The habits and customs of a people, my Lord, are not so easily changed in any country, more particularly in Hindostan.

With regard to the Colonial produce raised in Java, China, Siam, &c. miserable as it is in quantity, as we have just particularly noticed, I have but one observation to make, that as it is, and may be imported into Continental Europe without difficulty, so it will find its way to this quarter, by the wants and efforts of nations who have no Sugar Colonies, if it can be supplied cheaper than these nations can obtain it elsewhere. Could this have been effected, Sugar Colonies would never have existed in the Western hemisphere, but that these Eastern countries never did this, nor are at present able to do this, is perfectly notorious. In all Germany, Sweden, Prussia, and Russia, the Colonial produce of the Western Slave Colonies, undersells the Colonial produce from the countries East of the Cape of Good Hope.—Every merchant knows this, and it cannot be unknown to *Anglus*.

If we turn to Sierra Leone, a *black* country, called free, we behold a still more cheerless and hopeless prospect. Mr. Macaulay, his friends, and his admirers, and the supporters of his system have, for nearly forty years, laboured *in their way*, with the national purse and force too at their command, and yet they have not been able to produce a single particle of Colonial produce, except *one barrel* of coffee—nay, not only this, but coffee is exported from Britain, for the internal consumption of the settlement, while a little cotton cultivation,

formerly established, has been abandoned. From that quarter, no supplies can ever reach this country.

In St. Domingo, notwithstanding the musquet, and the *Gum-Arabic Thorn*, employed as a scourge by *Christophe* and *Henri*, and the arbitrary and military laws and military punishments of *Boyer*, we find the sugar cultivation dwindled down to 300 tons exported to every quarter, instead of 120,000 tons as formerly. The price of what is raised for internal consumption or exportation, stands in the market in St. Domingo, though produced by *free labour*, at 10 dolls. per cwt. above one-third more than what the price is in Cuba, or in any of the British or other European Slave Colonies. And I will assert that the quantity cannot be increased, nor the cultivation extended, but by *compulsory* labour; and further, that free labour by blacks in St. Domingo, where it produces any thing, never can produce any one article of Colonial produce, to come in competition in any foreign market, with Colonial produce raised by the labour of Slaves. *Anglus* may fret and fume, abuse and misrepresent as much as he pleases, but declamation will not obliterate facts or figures, and he may produce me, if he can, one PROFITABLE mercantile invoice to refute what I state. Such I must have, not his declamation and concealment of facts.

Let us examine more closely, my Lord, this bravado about the alacrity with which the free or the emancipated savage, labours in the countries within the Torrid Zone. Emancipation was tried, my Lord, in more places than one, without insurrection or tumult, and ruin was every where the consequence to all concerned. *Victor Hugues*, that firebrand whom the GODDESS OF REASON sent to cover the West Indies with anarchy and blood, but whom Mr. Stephen gently denominates, "*the popular founder of Negro freedom*," declared the slaves in Guadaloupe free. The island was instantly converted into a theatre of civil war, and became a den of incendiaries, robbers, and pirates. They lived for some time by plundering the commerce of our Colonies. Upon the arrival of General *Desforneaux* in the island, to succeed Victor Hugues, he found the Colony in the most deplorable state, without order, without law, without safety, without justice, without money, without commerce or cultivation. The most

afflicting scenes of misery presented themselves on every hand. The female proprietors were found in the most cruel state of want, without bread, and without clothes for themselves or their children. After some bloodshed, the refractory negroes were subdued, and slavery restored, under the authority of those very men who had been foremost to join in emancipating the slaves. In Cayenne the same scenes took place, and in the course of two years, one-third of the negro population were cut off by dissipation and idleness. Under Victor Hugues, "*the popular founder of Negro freedom,*" slavery was without difficulty restored in that Colony, the negroes returning under the yoke as a deliverance from misery. At the capture of the place by the British and Portuguese, in 1809, Victor Hugues was found the owner of an estate and slaves, while amongst the stipulations that he made with the captors of the settlement, for the future good of the place, was, that they should send all free negroes out of the Colony.

In what country is it within the Tropics that we find the barbarians or the savages voluntarily following cultivation? In Columbia the only cultivation that was and is carried on, was performed by slaves. In Mexico it is the same, and whether in time coming the free people of those countries will cultivate the soil to obtain a surplus Colonial produce or gain, time only can determine. As yet they have not done so. In Brazils the cultivation is almost entirely carried on by slaves. In all Africa the labour is carried on by slaves, and in all Tropical Asia, slaves are numerous in every country and state. In South America do we find the descendants of the original natives engaged in agriculture, or any improvement? No! In Mexico, says a late traveller, "the character of the Indian population, which exceeds two millions and a half, remains *very much the same* as that of the lower class is described to have been *at the time of the conquest.* The *same indolence, the same blind submission to their superiors, and the same abject misery,* are to be remarked. From the *Cacique,* or Indian magistrate of the village, to the most abject of his fellow sufferers, they are indolent and poor." Centuries of connexion with civilized life, have made no impression on this race. In Canada it is the same with the native tribes.—In the United States it

is the same.—In Surinam and all Guiana it is the same. The native Indian remains uncivilized, poor, and indolent, and wretched, though free as the air he breathes. In the Cape of Good Hope we find the surrounding savages, and the savages within its bounds, in a similar state. "The first settlers," says a very sensible letter from a gentleman at the Cape to his friend in Scotland, (*Edinburgh Observer*, January 4th, 1825,) "found the Hottentots sunk in a lower degree of barbarism, than the other inhabitants of Africa," and to this day "nothing has been done to ameliorate their condition. Instead of one master, they are subject to a constant change of tyrants." &c. Why, I would ask *Anglus*, is it that not a word is heard of ameliorating the condition of the Hottentots in this part of our dominions, the Indians in Guiana and Upper Canada, the condition of every one of whom is worse than that of a slave, and at the same time, not so productive or advantageous to the human race.

The whole arguments and theories of *Anglus* and his adherents, go upon the principle that the negroes of Africa, and the natives of Europe and of the East—of the Torrid and of the Temperate Zones, are capable of similar exertions in their different and even opposite climes, and that the same feelings, pursuits and researches, prompt, guide, and animate them. Nothing can be more fallacious, and to Statesmen no idea so dangerous. The history of ages—the review of their state, their acquirements and their pursuits at the present moment, disprove the childish theory. I am not inquiring into the causes of this, but merely stating the fact. The difference of their ideas is strikingly exemplified in the following curious fact. The native African princes around the new American settlement in Africa, attacked and wished to destroy or expel all the settlers, and the reason they adduced for doing so, was, that the Americans had not civilized them as they had promised, and as they had held out to be their object! You must work with such materials, my Lord, not as you would wish, but as you can make them work, to accomplish the civilization of the people, as planned by heads more intelligent than their own.

Let us examine a little more closely the countries, about the freedom of which *Anglus* makes such boasts, the produce there

raised, and whether it is produced from necessity, or from considering it a duty and for their own emolument; or from having it imposed upon them as a task by controlling authority—the distinguishing mark of free and compulsory, or SLAVE LABOUR. The mere savage—the natives of Africa and the barbarians in Java, Siam and Cochin China, driven by the calls of cold and hunger, may labour in some shape or other (agricultural, however, is always the last) to earn what will supply their scanty, their momentary wants, but as yet they, and more especially those in Java and Siam, have never done more. None of them labour or cultivate the soil to produce those returns necessary to obtain the luxuries and superior comforts of life, and those means and resources which are indispensable to defray and maintain the civil, military, judicial and religious establishments of civilized States. Where despotic Governments exist among them, the people are *compelled* to labour by arbitrary or less arbitrary laws, according to their degree of knowledge and civilization, in order to cultivate the ground and supply their own wants and the national resources, but where despotic Governments and even personal slavery do not exist, then in those places we find that scarcely any cultivation is known. We do not require the authority of *Anglus* to ascertain or to point out these facts.

In Letter No. 2, *Anglus* taunts the writer in the *Quarterly Review* with the recommendation to try wages instead of compulsion amongst the Colonial agricultural blacks. The sneer, for it is nothing else, comes with a bad grace from him. With the aid of the whipping post, the whip and the chain, the worst, and but seldom used weapons of West India terror, together with wages at the rate of 5s. to 7s. 6d. per day, paid out of the Treasury of Great Britain, they have not, at Sierra Leone, after 37 years' labour, been able to make the liberated African population raise even sufficient country roots and vegetables to supply their own wants.—Not a single thing have the Negroes at Sierra Leone been brought to do in agriculture that every Negro in Africa, however rude, has not always done for himself—nay, in the dominions of the Kings of Benin and Dahomey, according to Mr. Dupuis, the land is cultivated to

the most luxuriant extent—very far superior to the cultivation in Sierra Leone.

In our West India Colonies there are 78,000 free coloured people. Not one of them is engaged in manual agricultural labour. They deprecate and despise it. Some free coloured persons possess properties, but they cultivate these by slaves. They never work with their own hands, and moreover, it is very seldom that free people cultivate exportable Colonial produce; cotton and coffee, to a limited degree, some of them produce, but rarely, if ever, is sugar cultivation attempted by them. These are facts notorious to every one acquainted with the Colonies. Let *Anglus* if he can, deny them.

St. Domingo, so frequently brought forward to prove that emancipated slaves will apply themselves voluntarily to hard agricultural labour, even were the fact as it is asserted, is not a fair criterion to enable us to judge. There, the emancipated slave, seized upon, as his right, all the property of the master which ferocity had spared. He had neither lands nor works to purchase or to build, and found, more especially as regarded coffee and sugar, the land in a high state of cultivation. He stood then upon very different ground to what our West India Slaves emancipated would stand, unless *Anglus*, after bereaving the master of his slaves, took his land and houses also. To place them upon a footing with the emancipated blacks in St. Domingo, would either cost the British Colonies a similar disastrous revolution, or one hundred and twenty millions of money. In St. Domingo there are, I allow, at present, blacks with considerable property, because they, as their share of the robbery, seized upon estates little damaged, and being of the military faction, who controlled the others, compelled the less fortunate individuals to labour for them, and increase their wealth. But had all the slaves in St. Domingo been emancipated, without having any fixed property given to them, would they have worked voluntarily to have obtained funds to procure it? I do not think they would. Yet this is the proper view to take of the subject, and to adduce it as data to guide us; and in this way the matter must be viewed, unless *Anglus* coolly contemplates the massacre and robbery of his colour. Yet

even with all these advantages, how often are the St. Domingo proprietor and labourer put to their shifts, by the opposition which produce raised by slaves gives them, in various markets? A few years ago, when coffee sunk so low in the Continental market, from the great influx of it from India and elsewhere, the blacks in St. Domingo were obliged to abandon the cultivation of it, and betake themselves to raise rice, but in which they were instantly met and overwhelmed, by the slave labour of the United States.

The United States are fields of industry, and, with unlimited means, for agricultural pursuits. Yet in these States there are, say some accounts, 400,000 free people of colour, destitute, perfect outcasts of society, despised and degraded, idle and dissipated, not one of whom ever think of engaging in agricultural labour. The industrious population of these States, who repel idleness, repel these people, or rather throw them off, because they are idle and indolent, and it cannot be unknown to *Anglus*, that at this moment, Boyer is getting them to St. Domingo in ship loads. Before they set out, however, they are compelled to enter into an agreement, that they will devote themselves to agriculture, and not become chargeable to the State as vagrants and paupers. Boyer, my Lord, and his panegyrists, may throw over this proceeding what gay veil they please, but these wretches, *forced* from the United States, and snatched at by Boyer, are neither more nor less than *African apprentices*—SLAVES, torn from their homes, and carried to St. Domingo, to perform that agricultural labour, which Boyer finds his present subjects will not perform. When once there, Boyer will make them work—they have no retreat and no friends.* Different in manners, language and habits, they must remain a separate and degraded class. As such, and if

* That such would be the helpless, degraded, and deplorable state to which these people would be reduced, I never doubted, but nevertheless, I scarcely expected to have found my expectations so soon realized. It is only a few days ago, since the United States Papers informed us, that as soon as they were landed in Hayti, the able bodied had muskets put into their hands; and the New York Papers, of the 19th and 20th November, just come to hand, under the head HAYTI, state:—"The last intelligence from this Island, represents the state of the times thence as such, that an *able bodied man and his wife*, by conducting a Coffee

their numbers are greatly increased, they may become very dangerous subjects to Boyer, by forming an alliance with France, and acting in concert with her, in her future views and attempts upon that island. That Boyer will ever be able, without the application of the scourge, or compulsion in some shape or other, to compel a population so dissipated and so indolent, to engage in industrious agricultural pursuits, is by no means probable. Soldiers he might have made them, and they may perhaps make themselves. If their numbers are not very large, however, they will be compelled to submit, and be forced to labour, I say forced to labour, for, notwithstanding the bravadoes of *Anglus*, there is scarcely such a thing as voluntary labour in Hayti. Every black found going idle, is instantly arrested and carried to prison, and there kept till his friends step forward and engage he shall go to work, which, without taking into account any other punishment, unquestion-

plantation, can earn only 69½ dollars a-year. Under such circumstances, it might well be supposed, that many of the emigrants from this country would be ANXIOUS TO RETURN; but THIS LIBERTY IS NOT ALLOWED THEM, official notice having been given, that the most *rigorous measures* will be put in force against vessels detected in carrying away *Haytians* or EMIGRANTS from the island, and that, in the event of the fact not being discovered till after the departure of the vessel, the *consignees* will be held responsible." What! so soon tired of Haytian liberty? I would ask *Anglus* what slavery is, if such a state is not slavery?

The preceding intelligence roused, as was to be expected, the activity of the New York planners of the system of transporting free coloured persons to Hayti, to do away, or EXPLAIN AWAY, as far as possible, the impression which the unfavourable facts had produced. Accordingly, in the New York Daily Advertiser, of December 25th, 1824, I find two letters from two of these Emigrants, dated Hayti, October 20th, and addressed to the Rev. Mr. Allen, Philadelphia. Written *in the house* of M. Inginac, they are sanguine in their expectations, and loud in their praises of the place. But in the midst of their plaudits, some important particulars, worth being known and attended to, peep out. "The Emigrants," say they, "appear to be well satisfied, except a few persons who expected to become great men and women, without seeking for it. The land is fertile; and all that is wanting is people to till it. We have a plenty of LAZY NATIVES and Americans here, and want *no more of that class*. Rogues and vagabonds have no need to come here; without they wish TO BE HARNESSED LIKE HORSES TO A PUBLIC CART, AND WORK ON THE PUBLIC ROADS!" Here we have *one mode* which is adopted in Hayti, to compel people to work, and this is one substitute for the whip, "to be harnessed like horses in a public cart," and in that state compelled to "work on the public roads!"

ably is compulsory labour.—No authority in Great Britain can do this, or resort to such a method of compelling our mechanics, when they strike work, to return again to labour. But they are free—the Haytians are not. The labour and hours of labour in Hayti, are prescribed by law, and to the same extent as during the existence of personal slavery. The sophistry of *Anglus* cannot gloss over, or deny these truths. *

I am, &c.

JAMES MACQUEEN.

Glasgow, 25th November, 1824.

* But of *Hayti* it may be said; though her exports are less, the internal consumption of the necessaries of life are greater. The imports so greatly reduced, refute such an assumption. But we have still a stronger test to ascertain this point. In 1791, they exported about 12,000 hides annually, which shows a considerable consumption of Butcher meat. In 1822, there is not one exported, and I presume *Anglus* will not assert, that the present Haytians eat the skins with the carcasses. An Englishman, from these *data*, would say their internal comforts, and necessaries, and luxuries cannot be so great as before the Revolution.

In page 72, the following Table regarding the Trade of Hayti, was incorrectly printed in a number of copies. It is here correctly inserted.

SHIPS AND TONNAGE.

	1783.			1822.	
	Ships.	Tons.		Ships.	Tons.
Trade France,	580	189,674		80	13,232
Do. Great Britain,	—	———		100	14,618
Do. American,	763	55,745		695	68,695
Do. Spanish,	259	15,417		22	585
Do. African,	98 say	29,400	all others	40	4,561
Total,	1700	290,236		937	101,691

COLONIAL CONTROVERSY.

Nos. XV.—XVI.

MISCELLANEOUS OBSERVATIONS.

To the Right Honourable the Earl of Liverpool.

My Lord,

The inability of the anticolonists to make any thing of Africans, whom they choose to denominate emancipated Africans, and their incapacity to govern, or improve the savage, has been strongly exemplified in Sierra Leone. Nor is it there alone, or with the peculiar system which they have there established, that they have been foiled. They were equally unsuccessful in governing and attempting to improve slaves. Yes, slaves! They try Negroes in every way. In every way they are unsuccessful.

About the year 1811, some valuable Sugar and Coffee Estates, and a considerable number of artisan Negroes, in British Guiana, the property of the Crown, from the right of conquest, were intrusted to a Commission, viz.—The Right Hon. N. Vansittart, the Right Hon. C. Long, paymaster of the forces, Mr. Gordon, Mr. Stephen, Mr. Wilberforce, and Mr. W. Smith, to instruct, enlighten, and improve the slaves, and to increase the crops by a new and philanthropic mode of ruling the former. This commission chose Mr. Macaulay as their Secretary; and what was better, the Consignee. To him all the crops were consigned. By him all the supplies were shipped; and to increase, as was conjectured, all these, the customary and more judicious mode of purchasing supplies in the Colony, was in a great measure relinquished; all the supplies were imported from Europe; all the crops exported to it, and in such vessels as Mr. Macaulay owned or appointed. Independent of the Commissions, and of the "*cheese parings and*

candle ends" as Consignee," Mr. Macaulay charged, and the Commissioners allowed him £300 sterling, per annum, for the salaries of Clerks and the rent of a counting-house—expenses altogether unprecedented in the history of West India affairs.

Under the management of this Commission, the decrease of slaves on these properties was MORE THAN DOUBLE the decrease, under the management of those who previously directed the estates. The crops sunk in a still greater proportion, and all the expenses were enormously increased. On the properties there were nearly 1200 slaves; 348 of these were artisans. The whole proceeds of the estates were absorbed in the management; and not only so, but considerable sums were drawn from the British Treasury to liquidate the deficiency. These estates were left £2000 in debt, though at that period, if properly conducted, they ought to have yielded £20,000 per annum. The Crown was offered, and had agreed to accept, an annual rent of £5,500—but the bargain was annulled, in order to place them under the Commission, and £2,500 of the public money was paid to *Major Staples*, who had rented them, in order to induce him to give up his bargain.

Notwithstanding the hue and cry which the anticolonists raise about separating wives from their husbands, and removing Negroes from one estate to another, the Commission removed the Negroes from one estate to another, and separated husbands from their wives, parents from their children. At length, upon the restoration of peace, the properties and slaves, with the exception of the *Winkel*, or artisan Negroes, were restored to their former Dutch proprietors. No accounts of the affairs of these estates, under this Commission, have, I believe, ever been published or furnished. In the Committee of Supply, June 9th, last year, I find Mr. Hume objecting in vain, to a sum of £1500 of the public money, going to Mr. Walker, the manager of the Winkel Negroes. In course of the proceedings before the House, (see Debate) it was stated, that these "slaves were all artisans, let out under proper protection, for hire. Their wages went to support the establishment: but they were INADEQUATE TO THAT OBJECT, as there were many old and infirm persons to be provided for." So that the whole proceeds of their labour are absorbed, and the agent over them finds it

necessary to claim against the British Government £1500 in one sum, and probably for one year!

What the expense of maintaining those Negroes is, no one knows, or is allowed to know. On the 13th April last, the House of Commons ordered to be laid before it, an account of all the Negroes belonging to the Crown, in the West Indies, together with the expense of maintaining them. From every Colony, and from every place, EXCEPT BERBICE, this was immediately done. Mr. Walker, the superintendent of these *Winkel* Negroes, refused to give His Majesty's Representative, the Governor of Berbice, any returns, (*Par. Pap.* No. 424, of 1824, p. 42,) but referred him to the Treasury, to whom he stated he had transmitted them. No returns are produced. My Lord, this nation cannot be put off with shuffling such as this. She cannot pay heavy sums of money at the calls of men, who refuse to give her any account of the same, and who are, moreover, at the head of departments, which ought to yield to her, as they yielded to her predecessors, a handsome Revenue, instead of being as they are, a burden upon, and draining her of large sums. So far from there being many old and infirm Negroes amongst these slaves, I find, from Parliamentary return, No. 424—1824, that out of 300, the number *(only!)* remaining last year, there are 121 males and females UNDER twenty years of age, and that from age and disease, the total number of invalids is 26 males and 23 females; all the rest are effective people, and of the remainder, 101 are females. Will Mr. Macaulay explain the cause of the great decrease of these Negroes, under a system where the whip, as an instrument of punishment, was abolished, and the slaves were placed under an agent of his choosing?

But, my Lord, it is not merely to the refusal of an agent appointed over Government negroes, to give any return of the expenses incurred, but it is the contrast, that the expenses in different Colonies afford, where these returns have been produced, to which I would direct the public attention. Thus, at page 26 of the paper just quoted, we find the maintenance of 133 Crown negroes on *Bonair Estate*, Grenada, for 1822, to be £1047, or £8 currency each, while in page 31, we find the maintenance of 93 Government negroes in Trini-

dad, for the same year, to be £3,410: 1s. 3d. above £36 currency each!—The former also yielding the Treasury some Revenue, the latter I believe none!

If ever, my Lord, the advantage of a local Legislature was seen, it is in this very instance. Trinidad has no local Legislature. Grenada has. It is composed of practical men, who, knowing well what expense ought to maintain a negro annually, would never pass such accounts as these just alluded to—£36: 2s. per annum, for the maintenance—the food and clothing alone for each negro! What glorious pickings, my Lord, would be in our West India Colonies, had *Anglus* and his friends their will, and all the Colonial Legislatures abolished—and what terrible data does the Trinidad annual expense of the maintenance of negroes there by the British Government afford, to estimate the expense incurred for our African brethren at Sierra Leone, where neither check nor conscience remain in pampering them! Will the eyes of honest *John Bull* remain shut for ever to such *black* leeches as are there set to suck his *precious* blood?

The anticolonists asserted, published and circulated that the revolt in Demerara was entirely occasioned by the suppression of Lord Bathurst's despatches, containing the orders of Government in conformity with the resolutions of the House of Commons, to meliorate, as it is called, the situation of the slaves. There is no point more incontrovertible or better established than this charge. It was rung in our ears day succeeding day, by all the anticolonial publications in this country. It formed the main point brought forward by Mr. Smith in his defence, before the tribunal which tried him. At the meeting of the anti-slavery Society, June 25th, the *Morning Chronicle*, in the report of the proceedings, informed us, that Mr. Wilberforce, Jun. read their Report, which stated, "that the SOLE CAUSE of the Demerara insurrection had been clearly proved to have originated in the concealment, by the Governor of the Colony, of the instructions from the Government at home." Mr. Macaulay, jun. in a speech revised, corrected, if not written out by himself for the *Morning Chronicle* and *New Times*, on the occasion, proceeded in the same strain, and the assertion became the burden of the song

of every anticolonist throughout the country. This assertion, so totally devoid of truth, the *Quarterly Review* exposed, but not to the extent which might have been done, but which, however, had the effect of making the Anti-slavery scribes, in some degree, to *eat in their words.* Accordingly, in their report published *subsequent* to the Review, they alter the passage from the "SOLE CAUSE" to the "PROXIMATE CAUSE!!"

This proceeding is, my Lord, a short specimen of anticolonial sophistry and chicanery. The assertion in every shape is utterly false. The Governor and people of Demerara could never conceal that which they had not received. On this point we have unimpeachable testimony. Mr. Buxton's motion and Mr. Canning's resolutions, or rather the regulations of the West India body in London, came before the House of Commons, May 15th, 1823. On the 28th May, Earl Bathurst, in consequence of these resolutions, wrote circulars to the different Colonial Governors, enclosing these resolutions, but merely calling their attention to them as a preparatory step; or, as was distinctly stated, to prepare them for what was to follow. In the Noble Earl's own words (p. 5, papers marked class B) "TO PREPARE THE MINDS of the slave proprietors to expect that an ORDER IN COUNCIL will be issued for the same object." This despatch went to Demerara by the 1st June Packet, and was laid before the *Court of Policy* on the 21st of July. On the 17th August (in 16 days) according to Governor Murray's letter of the 11th, (class B, page 115) the Court of Policy agreed to the suggestions contained in Lord Bathurst's despatch of the 28th May, and decreed the abolition of the punishment of flogging female slaves, wherever that mode of punishment continued. On the 12th June, Earl Bathurst again addressed the Governors of the Colonies, stating, "*I am not yet prepared* to communicate to you the *definitive instructions* which His Majesty's Government will issue with respect to the measures" under consideration to ameliorate the state of the slaves, "but you will be directed by MY DESPATCH by the early July packet." Accordingly, on the 9th July, Earl Bathurst wrote to the different Governors, and to the Governor of Demerara in particular, a despatch containing general instructions, which occupies

nearly seven folio pages of close printing, and similar in its import to the ORDER IN COUNCIL issued in March last, to be taken as the basis of the Colonial laws, to be enacted for the object in view. The Packet sailed on the 11th July, reached Barbadoes on the 11th August, and Demerara on the evening of the 19th! "*Your Lordship's despatch of the 9th July*, says Governor Murray in his despatch, August 31st, (class B, p. 120) "*reached Demerara on the evening of the 19th inst.* THE DAY AFTER THE REVOLT," which, it is well known, and cannot be denied, broke out on the 18th August!

Can *Anglus* deny or contradict one of these facts. I challenge him, *if he can*, to do so, and till he can obliterate these official documents and the days of the year, or *circumscribe* the breadth of the ATLANTIC OCEAN, they must stand uncontradicted, and standing so, I ask him with what face himself or "his friends and admirers" can accuse the authorities of Demerara of suppressing documents which they had not received?

All who will allow themselves to think or to receive information, know, that it was the discussions in this country and the inflammatory publications of the Anticolonists in it, and the activity of Mr. Smith, which occasioned the fatal revolt in Demerara. Governor Murray's letter of the 24th August, announcing the revolt, and before Mr. Smith's share in it came to be known, distinctly charges the revolt to the former, and subsequent proof clearly brought home the connexion of Mr. Smith with it.

I shall dismiss this part of my subject with a few observations.

The annals, my Lord, of the British Parliament, I think I may assert, cannot produce another instance except Mr. Brougham's motion on Mr. Smith's case, where 146 members voted for a cause, and seemed to have made up their minds, and formed their decision upon a document published by the London Missionary Society, regarding events in a country 4000 miles distant, and upon secret, undisclosed private authority, in preference to documents furnished by your Lordship's administration upon the authority of your official and accredited agents, responsible for all their actions, and

tangible in a moment by the firmest arm of the Constitution for any error, intentional or unintentional, which they might commit. Monstrous, daring, unconstitutional and dangerous, my Lord, as was the course pursued on this occasion, still it was pursued, and had the London Missionary Society carried their object by the vote, they sought in the House of Commons, then THEY, not your Lordship and your colleagues—their irresponsible and inconsiderate agents and servants, and *not* the responsible and intelligent servants, and officers of the British Government—would have been the rulers of Great Britain—the rulers irresponsible and armed with unlimited power! Had Smith's question, I repeat it, been carried, my Lord, by adopting secret, irresponsible authority, (now understood to have been transmitted by a venal placehunting lawyer) throwing aside official and responsible authority, the result must have been as I have stated—how long the country would have endured such authority is another question; but I may venture to assert not a tithe of the time it endured a "*broad-bottomed Administration.*"

"On one side," says Mr. Macaulay, "we have, 800,000 colonial bondsmen, with nearly the entire British nation; on the other, less than 2000 proprietors of Sugar estates in the West Indies, *aided by those in this country*, whom their Parliamentary influence *or their good dinners*, or their common hostility against Saintship, or the mere ties of blood and interest may attach to their cause."

The preceding effusion, in the best style of *Anglus*, is a feeble specimen of the domineering and confident tone assumed by the enemies of our colonies. My Lord, poll the intellect of the country, and putting forward Mr. Macaulay *in propria persona*, as the moving power of the whole machine, with the words, "*sole Prize Agent*," and commissions on the Sierra Leone bubble, marked on his forehead, and then request those to walk aside with him who approve of his daring charges, and dangerous views against our Colonies, and I will venture to assert not one in a thousand of the people of this country, or even of the West India bondmen would join him; while, of 150,000 free people in our Colonies, not one would. With regard to "the Parliamentary influence" alluded to, your

Lordship, I am persuaded, will read with a smile of contempt, the daring and vile insinuation, that His Majesty's Government maintain slavery in the West Indies, and grant favours through the channels of West India Proprietors for "THEIR Parliamentary influence," to support your administration, and enable you to carry your views—*Anglus* means this, or words have no meaning. I am one of those, my Lord, in this country, who support the cause of our injured Colonies; and, my Lord, I dare *Anglus* and all his band, to shew where, or when "Parliamentary influence" was ever either used or required for my advantage or my interest. His narrow soul, it would appear, cannot conceive that any human being can be animated with independent or disinterested principles or exert these in the cause of their country.

But, my Lord, the charge of "Parliamentary influence" to maintain their property, or, as Mr. Clarkson would call it, their "OPPRESSIONS," comes with a bad grace, indeed, from the pen of an individual who boasts of possessing it, to a degree sufficient to *influence* and direct the measures of Government in every thing he has in view. "MY DEAR SIR," says Mr. Macaulay to Governor Ludlam, "a word in *private*, respecting the AFRICAN INSTITUTION. I cannot help regarding IT as an IMPORTANT ENGINE. We have many zealous friends in it, HIGH IN RANK AND INFLUENCE, who, I am persuaded, are anxious to do what can be done, both for the Colony and for Africa!" In looking over the list affixed to their 10th Report, I observe 23 Members of the House of Lords; and a still greater number in the House of Commons, which compose the higher and more influential, though perhaps less active parts of the "IMPORTANT ENGINE," which *Anglus* asserts he can set to work, to do what he pleases, and more especially, to "*save His Majesty's Ministers the trouble of thinking.*" Nor is this all, my Lord, the greater part of this Parliamentary array, the mass of the Members in the Lower House, are there as the Representatives of Rotten Burghs! Places, I do not say, but of which it has been said out of doors and in doors, that they are bought and sold, like as West India slaves are bought and sold—for money, and by and to the highest bidder. For *Anglus*, therefore, my Lord, to talk about or sneer at "Parliamentary influence," to accomplish interested and profitable

views, is a high degree of assurance; and shews, while he has an immense opinion of his own skill, and influence, and importance, that he has a mean opinion of the knowledge of the people of Great Britain.

Next, we are told, my Lord, that the cause in which *Anglus* is engaged, namely, the emancipation of the West India slaves —the overthrow of our Colonial system, is the cause of "THE UNIVERSAL FREEDOM OF MAN." *Anglus* thinks he has brought forward something new. He is wrong. The GODDESS OF REASON was before him in the scheme. The Universal freedom of man! This, from the lips of an East India Proprietor, perhaps a Director, whose vote by ballot, keeps 120,000,000 of our fellow creatures—"GOD'S CREATURES" too, as well as our African brethren, and in all things superior to the latter, in a state of political slavery, where they have as little to say in the measures that govern them, as any slave in the West Indies—whose vote by ballot, I repeat, maintains amongst that population, the most degraded system of personal slavery in the world, and the most barbarous superstition known in any quarter of the globe, Africa excepted. To hear such a boast and avowal, from such a quarter, is really ludicrous.

The assurance and presumption in these quotations, are equally remarkable and conspicuous. But we come to higher and bolder flights of imagination—more appalling temerity. We are told that the immediate emancipation of the slaves in our Colonies, is "THE WORK OF GOD." I say IMMEDIATE emancipation, because if their emancipation is "the Work of God," it cannot be deferred till to-morrow, or to a time or an hour, agreeable to the opinion or views of *Anglus*, or any other individual whatever. To-morrow may never come; and my Lord, I should like to hear *Anglus* explain, why the emancipation of our West India slaves, is "*the work of God*," NOW, more than it was ten years, or a hundred years ago—or why this work is limited to the emancipation of West India slaves only! It cannot be "*the work of God*," because it is so limited. HIS work is the same in every country, and in every climate, and equally imperative in all. THE APOSTLE PAUL, who certainly knew "*the work of God*" better than Mr. Macaulay, or that terrible perverter of the genuine principles of Christianity,

the *Christian Observer*—the APOSTLE PAUL I say, taught no such doctrine. In none of the injunctions or precepts which he has left us, do we find him inculcating the doctrine, that to do and to perfect "*the work of God*," it was necessary and imperative to emancipate all the personal slaves in the Roman Empire. The Apostle confined himself to the Christian religion, and never intermeddled with Civil Government, but to support it. He knew that *genuine Christianity* taught and practised would meliorate and improve every political institution, without danger, and without convulsions.

But, my Lord, this is not the only difficulty in which *Anglus*, has by his temerity, involved himself. If the emancipation of the slaves in our Colonies, by a prompt Legislative Act, is "the work of God," then it follows, not only that this country, during the last 150 years, but your Lordship and your colleagues, who, as her rulers have maintained, and seem yet resolved to maintain personal slavery in our Colonial possessions, have, by doing so, been doing, and are doing the WORK OF THE DEVIL—there is no medium. In this case, there can be no neutrality. Nor is this all. Mr. Wilberforce himself is enrolled on the same side. As a Statesman, and as a Legislator, he has not only uniformly supported the measures of Government, which upheld for national advantages, the system of personal slavery, but at the opening of the Session of Parliament, in 1797, when *Mr. Bryan Edwards*, a WEST INDIA PLANTER, arraigned the Administration, for attempting the conquest of additional West India Colonies, more especially for the attempt made by our fleets and our armies, to conquer St. Domingo, and reduce the Negroes there, who had emancipated themselves, again to a state of slavery, Mr. Wilberforce stood boldly and manfully forward, the champion of Ministers, repelled the charges of Mr. Edwards, and defended all that had been done!

"THE WORK OF GOD!" And this said—the Deity appealed to and brought forward, my Lord, in the same letter, and in the third paragraph of the same letter, from that wherein we find it threatened and avowed, that in order to complete and accomplish anticolonial labours, the East India Sugar question is to be brought forward by Mr. WHITMORE, and

carried next Session of Parliament, which measure is to extend the cultivation of sugar in India, improve their civil and political institutions, their worldly interests, and their worldly comforts; and finally, to advance the price of East India Stock, and fill the purses of East India Proprietors, with gold and silver! *Anglus*, my Lord, if words have a meaning, has the fearful presumption to bring forward the Deity, as interesting himself with mercantile theories and speculations—to call men's worldly interests and pursuits, "the work of God!!" I leave your Lordship and the public to determine, whether such declarations are BLASPHEMY or HYPOCRISY, or both.

The good sense of the Country, my Lord, must rouse itself to crush such a profane application of references, the MOST HOLY, as the quotations I have referred to disclose; or, the next thing we shall hear is, that it is "THE WORK OF GOD," to make *Anglus* PRIME MINISTER of Great Britain! And that the national debt ought not to be paid, because WAR is contrary to the *spirit* of Christianity.

The case of the harassed and persecuted Colonies is abundantly obvious and plain. They are accused unjustly. They are not allowed to defend themselves. They are condemned unheard. Measures are pursued as if they were guilty, when they are not so. To you, my Lord, they look, and have a right to look, to protect them from the last disgrace and danger which can befall British subjects, condemnation upon *ex-parte* evidence, and not only so, but in the face of evidence, offered to rebut the charges which are brought against them.

The laws of England (right or wrong, politic or impolitic, is not here worth inquiring into) constituted the slaves in our colonies property—a perpetual inheritance. No act of the nation can, for any purpose or for any reason whatever, without gross injustice, reduce a *fee simple* to a LIFE RENT, or in a direct manner do any thing which may change or deteriorate the value of that property without full indemnification *in limine*. If a different course is at present pursued against our colonies it may be so in a future day with regard to any other species of property in this country. The national debt, the landed estate,

our neighbour's house, his ox or his ass, may, as "THE WORK OF GOD, "be removed out of the way of this man, and into the way—*the hand of another*, by the same dangerous principles and hypocritical reasoning. Take the whole property of the colonies, my Lord, at the valuation which mortgages by English law affix to it, into the hand of the nation, as the guarantee, and from the annual proceeds of the whole colonial returns under any regulations the nation pleases to apply, pay off the present proprietors and mortgagees, principal and interest, till paid, and all will be satisfied. Every other mode of procedure must be injustice, because while it increases the danger it deteriorates the value of the property. The danger of revolt, my Lord, under the mode of proceeding here recommended is less than under any other. Every man also will then have a fair—an impartial opportunity of advancing his mite to wipe away the national transgressions, so greatly deplored and so loudly lamented, and the slave would (if he really wishes to work for his liberty,) be enabled by greater exertion, to accelerate his emancipation, and to know that he is doing so, while, at the same time, he would be sensible, that till he did accomplish his emancipation by labour, that he was under the command of a power which could control and compel him. The plan, no doubt, presents difficulties (what plan does not?) but it is the only *honest* one. If any individual, after such a valuation, choose to re-purchase any part of his property and renounce the national guarantee, then the nation would be relieved from so much of her burden, and the future risk and loss would be his, not hers.

The value of all property in the Colonies, as fixed by mortgage valuations, previous to the commencement of Buxtonion legislation, was about *one hundred and seventy millions* sterling. One hundred and twenty millions of this may be reckoned as employed in agriculture—the remaining fifty millions in houses, and slaves—mechanics and domestics. The annual interest of the whole, at the rate which the public funds yield or banks give, say 3 per cent. is £5,100,000, viz. £3,600,000 agricultural, and £1,500,000 for other property. Take the returns from this at 10 per cent. Rent; and at £20 sterling, the hire of domestics, and other negroes, per annum, the amount would be

about seven millions per annum, which would liquidate principal and interest on this portion of the property, in ten years, for those that are able-bodied people, and ten more would ransom their wives, and their children. The gross value of the proceeds from the agricultural part, are at present estimated, by the official returns, at nine millions sterling per annum. But this is very low, and were the duties on rum and sugar reduced, as in justice they ought to be (and as Anticolonists could not under such circumstances object to) the value would be raised to twelve millions per annum. Now the expense in agricultural properties is equal to about 19s. per cwt. on each cwt. of sugar, which would make the annual expense for all supplies and management, £3,600,000. This with the interest, an equal amount, would make £7,200,000 per annum to be deducted, leaving £4,800,000 to liquidate the principal of £120,000,000. At this rate, 20 years would liquidate the whole just claims of the West India proprietors, and the national faith, which is the foundation of her strength and her power, remain inviolable, unless the management of the whole concern were, like the Berbice estates, placed in the hands of *Anglus* and his associates, when your Lordship may rest assured that were they and our African brethren to live together, to direct and be directed, to the age of Methuselah, instead of the latter being ransomed, they would then be found to be deeply in debt, and all the properties, from bad management, run out of cultivation. Bring sugar to the average price of 67s. per cwt. and rum to 4s. per gallon, and other produce in proportion, and under prudent management, the slaves and other property (then to be theirs) in the Colonies, would be ransomed in the way and by the termination of the period mentioned.

Under any other circumstances than these just mentioned, suppose the slaves in our Colonies emancipated, what would they do for want of means to carry on cultivation? Where is the capital? Where would be the credit? Would *Anglus* advance money upon such security? He has never done so in Sierra Leone, and we may be assured he would not do so, under such circumstances, in the West Indies.

Amidst the ardent desire for emancipation which prevails, and the various theories and plans proposed to effect it, or to make

an experiment preparatory to its adoption, it appears to me strange that the Cape of Good Hope has never been thought of or pitched upon. In that settlement there is about 120,000 inhabitants, only 30,000 of whom are slaves. Why not purchase all these at once, and liberate them as an experiment? The sum requisite to do so could not be great, and if successful, then we had sure data to go upon to commence similar operations in another and more important quarter. The cultivation of the Cape is more adapted to the free cultivator and the European constitution than the West Indies, and the settlement is so completely isolated from all our other, particularly from our slave possessions, that nothing going on at the Cape could be dangerous as an example to other quarters. There an experiment might be tried with the least possible danger, and at no great expense—at least at less expense and danger than any where else.

Error, my Lord, seems to run through the general proceedings of the Mother Country towards her Colonies—Error not more unjust than dangerous. In every philippic against them, we constantly hear the designation "BRUTES" applied to the slaves, and the most pointed assertions made, that they are looked upon and treated as such, and ranked in the same scale. My Lord, the assumption and assertion are false. The negro is neither considered as a brute, nor treated as such. The history of every nation on earth, and in every age, shews that men may be reduced to that state in society, and still be considered members of that society. With equal justice might our headstrong anticolonists charge THE AUTHOR of the Tenth Commandment with considering and ranking the slave and the brute—the animate being and the inanimate thing as on the same scale, when HE forbids under one law to covet the wife—the house—the man servant or the maid servant (bond servants or *slaves*) or the ox or the ass, &c. Such a terrible perversion of language, and such bitterness of speech as I have just noticed, may be heard from the lips of *Anglus*, but ought never to escape from the lips of Statesmen.

The feelings of the white Colonists are in every instance, and in every thing, wounded and trampled under foot in the most wanton and unnecessary manner. All their actions, and all

their conduct, and all their proceedings, are viewed with a jaundiced eye, and through the most distorted medium. They stand the butt and the scorn of every *quack* in politics, and schoolboy in philanthropy—they are considered as unworthy thought, unworthy regard, undeserving protection. And sorry I am to say, my Lord, that these feelings are not confined to, or expressed by, the misled multitudes in this country, but they rush into our Legislative Acts, and are strongly marked in the proceedings of our Government. A black skin, my Lord, it would appear, is only to claim notice, consideration, or protection. Thus, in the Bill passed during last Session of Parliament, consolidating the Slave Laws, it is by a clause enacted, and by the said clause, the JUDGE of the Vice-Admiralty Court is authorized and empowered, to FINE AND IMPRISON a master in the West Indies on the complaint of his servant, if that servant be an AFRICAN APPRENTICE; but not one word is said how the servant is to be tried or punished if the master complains. No! If his skin is white, for him there is no law. The trial by Jury —an appeal to his peers, the unalienable birthright of every Briton, is abrogated and set aside by a British Act of Parliament, and despotic power without appeal is thereby vested in the hands of a subordinate Court, and a subordinate Officer!!

In the year 1790, when few free coloured people in Grenada possessed agricultural property, the Act which compelled, under a penalty of fifty pounds, every person who had slaves, to have a white man for every 50 Negroes, was felt to bear hard upon the RARE people of colour. The Legislature, accordingly, repealed that law as to them. Of late years, however, free coloured people, as legal heirs to whites, and by other means, have succeeded to numerous agricultural properties. These persons, to save outlay, employ, as overseers, free blacks or mulattoes, very often of indifferent characters, at very trifling salaries, to do the work of white overseers. By this means the law is evaded, and the effective strength of the whites considerably diminished, and the Colonial danger consequently increased. The Colonial Legislature perceiving the magnitude of the danger, lately repealed the clause enacted in favour of the free people in 1790, and placed them upon the same footing as the white proprietors, liable to the fine or tax for the deficiency of

white servants in their plantations. Nothing could be more just, reasonable and politic, than this law; yet, my Lord, if I may credit the public papers, the Colonial Government is informed that the King and Council refuse to confirm this law!

Where every bond of confidence is thus broken through, and every action, however upright, is beheld with suspicion, and annulled as oppression, can affection be kept alive, or union maintained?

Anglus, my Lord, seems exceedingly indignant at the hint given by the *Quarterly Review*, that the West India question has been made "*a party question*." The quick feeling evinced by *Anglus* on the occasion, is sufficient of itself to convince me that the *Quarterly Review* is right. He must really conceive the public to be exceeding blind, if it did not see that this is really the case, and exceedingly silly if he does not know, that to annoy an existing Administration, or black-ball any authority acting under it, there are individuals who would make a "*party question*" of any subject, however important, or however trifling. If he does not know this, let him inquire at the *Edinburgh Review*, and he will learn the fact.

In one of his letters, and speaking in the name of his party, *Anglus* says, "IF WE," had only the great West India proprietors at home to deal with, our business would be easy, but the individual owners of small properties in the Colonies pertinaciously oppose our innovations. Their representations and objections, says *Anglus*, we should not listen to, and they ought not to be listened to. The arrogance of the expression "WE," must be obvious to the most careless. What, let me ask, have "WE" to do with it? It is a question of property and civil rights, and as such must be discussed and determined by the parties most deeply interested—between the "*small proprietors*" and the British Government, the Constitutional organs of the British nation. Will *Anglus* be bold enough or daring enough to say, that "WE" are either the one or the other, but more especially the latter? Because the small proprietors are weak and Britain is strong, that is a particular reason why her laws should be exerted for their protection. The British Constitution knows not the distinction of strong and weak, or knows it only to protect the latter against the encroachments of the former.

The principles advanced by "WE,"—*Anglus*, may be Sierra Leone laws, but these are not yet established in the Charaïbbean Archipelago.

Anglus states, that I would believe any thing to the prejudice of the African Institution. He asserts what is not true in his acceptation of the words. He knows well what I mean by the African Institution—not all those honourable names enrolled in that Institution, but the more active members thereof; in fact, my Lord, the furnishers of the *fuel*, the working firemen, and the subordinate and chief engineers, who attend and manage the "ENGINE." It is these I mean when I speak of the African Institution. *Anglus* knows quite well who they are. I will candidly admit that in their management of that engine, I see nothing to admire, nothing to imitate, but much, very much, to blame and to censure. I do not say that it was one of these personages who wrote the following passage in the last number of the Edinburgh Review, but I believe it was:—"If the work is not done, the Negroes will do it themselves, and the *bulk* of their fellow subjects WILL REJOICE that it is done, however DEPLORABLE THE CONSEQUENCES may be!!" My Lord, I certainly do not hold a very favourable opinion of either the head or the heart of him who wrote this, and if the African Institution as a body—or if all connected with it, do not disavow the sentiment here advanced, they deserve much severer reprobation than any I have ever bestowed, or can bestow, upon the "IMPORTANT ENGINE." A JUBILEE in Great Britain, when massacre and ashes cover her fine Colonies! Is it possible! Yes, it is announced!!

Anglus, in vindication of himself and his associates, for their intemperate, inconsiderate, unconstitutional, and unjustifiable proceedings, asks, in Letter No. 2. "In this case alone are we not to try our conduct by the immutable principles of right and wrong which are laid down in the WORD OF GOD—in this case alone are we not to appeal to the *Christian maxim* of doing to others as we would they should do to us." *Anglus* must be a bold man indeed, after all his proceedings, to make the appeal he here does. By this rule I would wish to see him walk. Let him lay his hand on his heart, and say if he has squared his conduct by it. Let him put himself in the place of our

Colonists, living conformably to the laws of their country, and say if his conduct to them has been guided by the "Christian maxim," or any part of "the Word of God." Let him produce me, if he can, from within the bounds of the Old Testament or the New, any passage to warrant him, or his associates, in branding, lacerating, or defaming the character of his fellow subjects, because under the laws of their country, they are masters of slaves: or let him produce me, if he can, within the range of the Sacred Volumes, one "*Christian maxim*" which says, it is lawful and just to deprive these fellow subjects of what is legally their property, or which authorizes him to teach the slave disobedience to, or revolt against his master's authority. I defy him. Nor is this all. "The *immutable* principles of right and wrong, which are laid down in the *Word of God*," expressly state, "*Thou shalt* not bear false witness against thy neighbour"—and "thou shalt not covet his man-servant, nor his maid-servant"—(SLAVES, male or female,) nor any thing that is thy neighbour's"—and "THOU SHALT NOT DO EVIL, THAT GOOD MAY COME." I am one of those, my Lord, who look to the authority of my Bible, in preference to the authority of *Anglus*, the Pope of Rome, or any who imitate their ways. *Anglus*, in Letter No. 5, accuses me in this cause of "a strength of prejudice and CONSEQUENT EAGERNESS of misrepresentation." Before my country, I challenge him to point out one instance where I have so acted, I call on him to say where I have misquoted or misrepresented any authority; and what I state from my own personal knowledge, I call upon him, from any acknowledged authority, to contradict me. Honestly and fairly, he knows he cannot. The most material parts of my publication stand unassailed and unshaken by him, nor even once ventured upon. On the East India Question, Sierra Leone, the Slave Trade in Africa, the Treatment of Slaves in the Colonies, he knows he must obliterate official documents, before he can meet or controvert my statements. *Anglus* has committed himself in the field of controversy, and, however high his rank, or great his wealth, he must know, or be taught to know, that the meanest British subject may meet him on points of fact, and civil rights, and justice, and national

policy. That Mr. Macaulay is a much wealthier and greater man than I am, is no answer to undeniable facts, and no proof of his averments; and from his lips I certainly shall not hear a different doctrine.

Experience, my Lord, will, and in a short time, enable your Lordship to ascertain whether my statements and opinions regarding Colonial matters, or those advanced by *Anglus* are the most correct, or the safest guides to walk by. I have no interest, my Lord, to deceive or to be deceived in the question, but *Anglus* has a deep *interest* in the issue of the theory he advocates. Only say, my Lord, that you mean to put the schemes of *Anglus* and his fellows in force in a short period, and a few months will see the West Indies stripped of the whole of their white population. It is a dream, my Lord, on the part of any one in Great Britain to suppose, that a single white person at present in the West Indies would, or could remain there, were their authority destroyed, and the black population emancipated from their dominion; and it is a still wilder and more extravagant dream to believe, as the anticolonists do, (see last number *Edin. Rev.*) that the small Islands could exist as well regulated, independent Negro States. No! the United States, or Colombia, if the latter is able to support her independence, would soon have the whole of them. Her conduct already shows us that she does not want ambition.

Anglus, my Lord, with his customary assurance, designates me "*the fiercest partisan*" of the Colonial cause. A steadfast defender of it, I acknowledge myself to be. But in it I have no interest. From it I derive no emolument whatever. Out of no charitable or combined subscription fund, is the *Glasgow Courier*, paid for the insertion of Colonial articles, and circulated over the country, as the anticolonial Gazettes containing the lucubrations of *Anglus*, "his friends and his admirers" are. Interest certainly could not lead me to oppose, as *Anglus* asserts I do oppose, "*almost the entire British nation.*" I hurl back on HIS head the epithet "*partisan*," with contempt and indignation.

I ought to apologize to your Lordship for the length to which this correspondence has extended. I found as I proceeded, the subject increase in importance. How far I have

defended myself from the accusations of *Anglus*, and how far I have exposed his bad faith, his chicanery, his exaggerations and his misrepresentations, I leave to your Lordship and the public to determine. Personal hostility or ill-will against *Anglus*, or any other person, I have none, but the most unalterable and invincible opposition to their dangerous schemes against our Colonies, and their imbecile plans with regard to Africa, (to these only my observations are confined and strictures apply) I certainly entertain, and must continue to entertain, till more rational, just, and reasonable ideas direct their actions. This controversy, from the spirit and the way in which *Anglus* brought it forward, claimed freedom of observation. I have not shrunk from expressing the truth. The subject is one of great importance—one which sits near my heart, and which must continue to do so, while the honour, the interests, and the prosperity of my country continue to animate and to influence it.

In the task which I have had to perform, my Lord, I have had a great difficulty to contend with. In which ever way I attempted to oppose Anticolonial folly, I was certain to subject my conduct to be misrepresented by prejudice or private hostility. Had I generally attacked what may be called the Anticolonial Societies, the hue and cry would have been raised against me, what! attack, deny or dispute, or impugn the motives or the statements of the African Institution in a body, the Anti-slavery Society, or other Societies as bodies of men, —Societies which comprehend so many individuals of high rank, character, talents, and moral worth in our Country. Such, my Lord, was never my intentions, my views, nor my objects, well knowing that in all these Societies, there are numerous individuals of the strictest honour, and integrity, and moral worth, who pursue improvement amongst mankind *animated with Christian meekness and charity*, and who would start back from committing any act of injustice or oppression against their fellow subjects; but who, nevertheless, are like other men, liable to be deceived and misled, and who have been deceived and misled by false information derived from quarters, from whence their honest and upright

minds could never for a moment suspect deception or misstatement. To guard against the possibility of having such a construction put upon my labours, as that of attacking or impugning the conscientious though dangerous proceedings of individuals, such as those I allude to; I have been compelled to adopt a course, which I am aware, will be set down by my opponents as personality—as personal invective and reproach—but I had no alternative. Justice compelled me to separate the names of a Lansdowne, a Holland, a Bexley, a Teignmouth, and a Wilberforce, and men like these who act with moderation and from principle; from the names, and the writings, and harangues, of our Broughams, our Lushingtons, our Macaulays, our Stephens, our Buxtons, our Clarksons, and our Croppers, "*et hoc genus omne*" individuals, who are actuated and instigated by very different views and principles from the former. In fact, my Lord, I have been in some measure compelled to combat my present opponent with his own weapons, and to answer his contemptuous vituperations launched against "the Bulls and the Blackwoods, the Couriers of London and Glasgow—the Bridges and the Macqueens; the Grossets and the Martins; "*et hoc genus omne*" by bringing forward and replying to, and exposing not the private affairs and persons; but the public lucubrations, charges, and accusations, on great public questions of the anticolonists personally named and alluded to. I have considered this exposition necessary, that I may put it out of the power of anticolonial sophistry to misrepresent my motives.

Whatever the results of the present anticolonial mania may be, I can reflect with satisfaction, that I have done my duty to my country, in raising my voice to oppose it. The sneers, the scoffs, and the scorn, and the SECRET PERSECUTIONS (brawlers about liberty are always the fiercest tyrants) of anticolonial "PARTISANS," will not make me depart from what I know to be truth, and what I feel to be justice. But should *Anglus*, contrary to my expectations, contrary to true policy, contrary to reason, and contrary to justice, succeed in his views, and bring round by his idle theories, and interested speculations, the destruction of our Colonies, the annihilation

of *one-fourth** part of all our foreign trade—and with it the ruin and massacre of a vast mass of his innocent countrymen—should he accomplish these things—should the triumph remain with his side, then to use the words of one of your Lordship's colleagues on another subject, I will say, "BE THAT GLORY HIS, BUT BE MINE THE CONSOLATION TO HAVE OPPOSED IT."†

I am,

JAMES MACQUEEN.

17*th December*, 1824.

* 1821. Imports into Great Britain and Ireland, ... £31,700,000
Of which sum there was in PRODUCE from the West Indies into Great Britain, value £8,367,477
Do. do. into Ireland, do. about 430,000
8,797,477

Parliamentary Paper, No. 274, of 1824, &c.

† Speech of Mr. Canning on Lord John Russell's motion for Parliamentary Reform, 1822.

APPENDIX.

To ZACHARIAH MACAULAY, Esq.

Sir,—I have perused the pamphlet containing in a continued narrative the letters, of which, you are considered to be the author, and which under the signature of *Anglus* you lately ushered into the world, through the columns of your Gazette, the New Times. So far as you have ventured upon any of the facts contained in my letters addressed to the Earl of Liverpool, there is really very little that requires lengthened observation on my part. There are, however, a few points in your Appendix, which require to be examined and to be exposed. Your Nottingham Bubble you have again and with your customary declamatory powers, incautiously and unguardedly attempted to blow into public notice. Your former imposition upon this Country exposed, you have not hesitated to advance with the most thoughtless confidence, misrepresentations (to give them no harsher name) still more bitter, in order to support and make good your cause.

I address you directly on this occasion, because you are "*the fiercest partisan*" of the anticolonial system, and because I am eager to return you cordial thanks for the important particulars, which, in your Appendix, you have condescended to lay before the Public, regarding that "fine healthy race —*all blacks*"—these Brothers and Sisters of yours, the Nottinghams of Tortola. I question much if a reference to that island, could have supplied me with documents more complete, and weapons more formidable than those which you have thus put into my hands, to enable me to expose your chicanery, your want of good faith, and to break to pieces the fabric which you would raise.

Permit me to observe, that you either have an exceeding bad memory, or else you conceive that those individuals in this country, interested in the Colonial contest, and who read your

works, can have no power of recollection, or you never would have ventured to bring before the public, the documents to which I allude, destructive alike to your veracity, your judgment, and your cause.

I proceed to these. You tell us, page 39 and 93, that the Nottinghams have increased "120 per cent." since 1790, and that "*this increase is not denied.*" Both assertions are equally untrue; both have been, and now are *again* most pointedly denied. I shewed in my *second* letter, addressed to the Earl of Liverpool, and upon authority which you cannot contradict, that out of 25, the number emancipated by Mr. Nottingham in 1776, *twenty* died without issue—that of the free females who had issue, not one of the children are the offspring of Nottingham fathers—that instead of "*intermarrying with each other,*" as you asserted, not one of the original Nottinghams were married, either amongst themselves or to others, and that only *one* female and *one* male, of what you choose to call their descendants, are married—that with the exception of four children, the whole increase, allowing it to be Nottingham, has arisen from illicit connexions formed by the females, with male slaves and free persons, not Nottinghams; and further, I shewed, that of the original number manumitted, only three now survive! In other words, I shewed, that instead of the Nottinghams having increased, "120 per cent." they have really decreased 800 per cent.! And, in a few years more, as their heritable patrimonial estate is gone, it is obvious that "*this little Colony of free persons,*" will be irretrievably lost and extinguished.

Unless, Sir, you can disprove the clear narrative drawn up by Mr. *Frazer*, I defy you to gainsay these facts, or to deny this conclusion. You have not attempted to shew, that the manumitted female Nottinghams were BORN with *self-creating powers*—you have not attempted to shew, that they had any *Hohenlohe* assistance in conception, and you have not attempted to prove, that the strangers—those free males, and the slaves who connected themselves with these females or their granddaughters, could not have propagated their species, by connexions with other free females; but that, to enable them to do so, the Nottingham females were absolutely necessary. Not

one of these points have you attempted to shew, or to prove, and yet, till you can prove them all, you may, with equal right, and equal justice, claim the issue of the females in question as your issue, and insist that they should bear your name, as insist that the children of *Jasper Rapeot* and *Jack Potter*, freemen; and of *Jeffry*, Mr. Pickering's slave, &c. &c. are Nottinghams. The argument and the conclusion, are alike irresistible.

To get out of the dilemma into which false information had led you, and smarting under the castigation which you had received, instead of repenting and retracting, as you ought, you come forward, and, in order to blacken the character of your fellow subjects, make partial statements, which, most unfortunately for you, expose still further your chicanery and your conduct in this anticolonial war. In page 92, you tell us, that though *Mr. Nottingham's* original deed of manumission, was dated New York, 1776, yet, "probably owing to the American war," that it was not enrolled in the legal records of Tortola, till 1784, nor the freedom of the individuals therein, particularly enumerated, completed and confirmed, till the enrollment in 1790, of a fresh deed executed in England, in 1789, by Mrs. *Hannah Abbott*, the sister and residuary legatee, of the late Mr. Nottingham. Although you have access to this deed, and could have given us the whole of it, you have only favoured us with one or two partial extracts, which proceeding is rather suspicious as to your object. But yet, with these extracts, I shall be able to make the subject abundantly plain. During the period, from 1776, till 1790, or "*during, at least, eight or nine years*" thereof, you assume, and you assert as a fact, that the Nottinghams continued "SLAVES" in "*the hands of agents*," (why not *slave drivers* at once? We shall see that reason presently) and that, by the harsh treatment which they, as slaves, received from the hands of these "agents," their number was reduced from "*twenty-six*," the original number manumitted, to "*twenty*," the number remaining in 1790, viz. *eight males and twelve females*," as particularly specified in the deed executed by Mrs. *Hannah Abbot*, in 1789.

Now, Sir, I may just remark, that we have nothing but your bold assertions, and evidently false gloss put upon docu-

ments in your possession, in support of the main points which you have advanced; but what will you, or can you say, when, from documents, ungarbled, produced by yourself, and certainly written by Mr. Nottingham, I prove the falsehood of every syllable which you have thought proper to advance. Turn then, Sir, to the pamphlet—YOUR PAMPHLET, entitled, "*the Substance of the Debate on Mr. Buxton's motion*," and, at page 234, as *supplied by yourself*, you will find at length, the original deed of manumission, executed by Mr. Nottingham, at New York, June 30th, 1776. In and by that deed, he decidedly and irrevocably manumitted the twenty-five Negroes, viz: "*Six men, ten women—four boys and five girls*," the objects of the present discussion. I call your attention, and the attention of the public, to this enumeration. My reason will presently appear. In the very next page of the pamphlet referred to, and immediately after the deed of manumission, *you add*, a letter written by Mr. Samuel Nottingham, and Miss Mary Nottingham, his sister, and addressed to George Nottingham, one of these emancipated Negroes, in reply to one from him, to Mr. Nottingham, (why not publish it?) which letter is dated, "*Bristol*, (England) 30th September, 1782," wherein he calls them, "*his late servants*," and adds, "remember what we write to thee, we write to *all of you*, who ONCE called us Master and Mistress; BUT NOW YOU ARE ALL FREE, as far as it is in our power to make you so.—Remember, that as *free men and women*, ye stand accountable for every part of your conduct, and must answer for the same, in your own persons, if you do amiss. And that you may be enabled to live honestly among men, we *have given you* our EASTEND PLANTATION, in *Fat Hog Bay*, with *every thing thereunto belonging*, which we will endeavour to have SECURED TO YOU, BY ALL LAWFUL WAYS AND MEANS, that none may deprive you, or your offspring of it, &c."

Now, Sir, here is a full and complete refutation, under Mr. Nottingham's own hand, and produced by yourself, of your assumption and malicious assertion, that the Nottinghams were not emancipated till 1786, or even till 1790, and, moreover, a clear elucidation of what the deed enrolled in 1784 was, namely, the legal confirmation of the previous gift of the lands

of his Plantation, "with every thing thereunto belonging," made to his emancipated Negroes. It disproves also, in the most satisfactory manner, your assertion, that these Negroes were left in the hands of AGENTS," (agents! did you mean to escape or seek refuge under *this word?*) for Mr. Nottingham speaks of none, nor refers them to any man acting for him, in any capacity whatever. Moreover, the letter just quoted, explains the meaning of the deed executed by Mrs. *Abbot*, in 1789, in which, according to your quotation from it, page 91, she "conveys and *confirms*, to the late servants of her deceased brother, a Plantation, called LONGLOOK," *without* any reference to, or mention of the slaves formerly emancipated by her brother. But this, I believe, is not all that the deed by Mrs. Abbot contains. I believe that it also contains, the bequest of a sum of money, £316 sterling, to "the late servants of her brother," which, as I stated, and you cannot deny, was bequeathed by her to them, and paid to them, by Mr. Dawson of Tortola, *but which they soon dissipated and wasted.* All this you conceal.

From 1776, therefore, the Nottinghams were free agents. It was not, and it could not be as you assume it was, "the American war" which prevented Mr. Nottingham from enrolling, or getting the deed of manumission enrolled in Tortola, because, in 1776, there was no difficulty in obtaining a conveyance from New York to that Island; and besides, we find before the conclusion of the war, that Mr. Nottingham had come to England. When he came, is not very material to my case, and you may find it out at your leisure. Besides, the enrollment of the deed, was only necessary to protect them from the future claims of heirs, but not to complete their freedom.*

* That Mr. Nottingham had an opportunity to transmit the deed of manumission to Tortola, at an early period, I am enabled to shew from good authority. While these pages were in the press, I received from a gentleman lately arrived from that Island, and who resided *fifty-one years in it*, the following particulars regarding Mr. Nottingham, and the negroes in question, taken from a written memoir by a Quaker, containing the history of the Friends in Tortola, commencing in 1743. Mr. Nottingham was originally from Wellenborough, in the county of Northampton. In December, 1749, he married Mrs. Hunt, the widow of Governor John Hunt, and whose maiden name was Middleton; her father, Captain William Middleton, holding as Patentee, one of the oldest grants of land,

The Nottinghams, I repeat, were free agents from 1776. They had no master, and no "agents" to rule over them, and, in fact, no person to mind them. Now, mark how the docu-

in Tortola, in *Fat Hog Bay*, dated about 1713. Besides this property, (*Longlook*) Mrs. Hunt possessed in right of her father, some other property in Tortola, which she joined her husband, Mr. Nottingham, *in selling* to John Shelton *in* 1778. In 1754, Mr. and Mrs. Nottingham, went to Newtown, Long Island, New York, and the negroes belonging to Mrs. Nottingham, which she held from her former husband, were left under the care of her sister, Mrs. Madox, who in 1774, lived in Mrs. Nottingham's house, in *Fat Hog Bay*. Betwixt that period, and 1776, Mrs. Madox died, and the negroes were then manumitted by Mr. Nottingham. My informant saw Mrs. Nottingham in her own house, in Long Island, in 1777, when Mr. Nottingham was preparing to go to England, which Mrs. Nottingham said she regretted much as she wished rather to return to Tortola. They had at that time a Niece with them, the mother of John Middelton Donovan, Esq. at present in Tortola, and WHO WAS SENT BACK TO TORTOLA BEFORE Mr. and Mrs. Nottingham went to England. My informant does not know the year they left America, but supposes it was about 1779, and he has no doubt, if not previously sent, that Mr. Nottingham's Niece brought the deed of manumission to Tortola. At the time of their emancipation, most of the negroes were old, and the legacy which Mrs. Abbot bestowed upon them was quickly spent, more especially by the oldest of them. Upon Mrs. Madox's death, these Slaves removed from the property where she lived, immediately adjoining *Longlook*, to the latter place, and built some houses on the lands which they had always previously cultivated. So far my informant; and if Mr. Nottingham found an opportunity to sell lands in Tortola, in 1778, he could also find an opportunity to send an order or intimation, that he had manumitted his wife's slaves—and at any rate, his NIECE could carry the deed.

The same gentleman from long and personal knowledge of the estates you single out, authorizes me to state, that on none of them was the decrease of slaves, occasioned by *hard labour, severity, and oppression*. These as well as others in the Virgin Islands, occasionally suffered severely from droughts, and the consequent scarcity of provisions. The decrease on the Estate of ARCHDEACON WYNNE proceeded, he says, "chiefly from the negro houses having been unfortunately erected in a situation which proved to be unhealthy, but especially from the loss sustained in the hurricane of 1819, and a great sickness which prevailed on the Estate in 1820, from the circumstance of the sea, during the hurricane having overflowed an extensive swamp near the negro houses, and which left behind a pestilential effluvia, from which the Slaves could not escape. If the use, *Sir*, to which you put the Registry returns are continued, it will render it necessary on the part of the colonies to transmit with every return minute details of the history and statistics of every plantation; otherwise their characters are not safe.

The gentleman also authorizes me to state, that in Tortola, the NOTTINGHAMS WERE CONSIDERED AS FREE PEOPLE FROM 1776—in fact from the death of MRS. MADOX. I do not consider myself warranted in blazoning the name of my informant in a publication going into the world, but it is privately at your service.

ments with which you have supplied me, turn against yourself. You produced them to blacken and to defame, and from them, you try to blacken and to defame the character of the Whites in Tortola. When the truth is known and inquired into, however, they give your cause the severest blow, that it has, as yet received from any quarter. In 1776, when emancipated, the Nottinghams consisted of "*six men, ten women—four boys and five girls!*" In 1790, fourteen years afterwards, you tell us, according to the deed executed by Mrs. *Abbot*, that "this little Colony," consisted of "*eight males and twelve females*," shewing a decrease of twenty per cent. in fourteen years, during which period, according to your own account, not a single child was born in "*this little Colony!*" Look at the features of this picture, Sir! Can you deny them? And acknowledging them to be correct, can a stronger and a more appalling picture be produced, to shew the depopulation, and the misery which result from premature, thoughtless, and *unprotected* emancipation? I hope it will not be forgotten by you—your "friends and your admirers," and that it will also be remembered by those who guide the destinies of this country and her valuable colonies.

But this is not all. Your charge of cruelty and oppression against "agents" who never existed, as the cause of the decrease you bring forward, not only falls to the ground, but your developement rolls inhumanity back upon the heads of those you admire—upon the head of Mr. Nottingham himself. It stands confessed that he emancipated these negroes in 1776, that he gave them nothing till a subsequent period, when he gave them a plantation, the cultivation of which had, I believe gone to wreck, for in the letter referred to, we find him addressing them as follows:—"If you have not wherewithal to cultivate and improve the *plantation* yourselves, we advise you to hire yourselves for a season to whom you please, as also the plantation, if you think it necessary, till you acquire a sufficiency to go on yourselves." Did they obey this counsel? Did they do either the one or other? Did they ever "acquire a sufficiency" to enable them "to go on" with the cultivation of the "plantation themselves?" I leave you to answer these questions, remarking that the case you have adduced, shews

that a great deal more is necessary to be bestowed upon slaves than their personal liberty. No wonder the Nottingham negroes made *free*, but left without capital, friendless, and destitute, decreased in numbers. Really, *Sir*, your friends are not much obliged to you for bringing forward to public observation such documents as you have done. But what do you care for them or for their memory, providing you can by misrepresentation or facts perverted, gain a point against our Colonies. But you have failed, the weapon you presented to the breasts of others, has in this instance turned and pierced your own.

The time, ink, and paper which have been spent and wasted on these Nottinghams and their cause, exceed in value all the produce which their labour ever has, or I believe ever will produce, and amidst the extraordinary and extravagant things which so frequently start up in this country, the most extraordinary and extravagant, is the folly which brings forward these people and their state, as proper *data* to guide the deliberations of the government of Great Britain, in one of the most important Legislative questions that ever Legislators or politicians were engaged in.*

* "It may behove the Methodist Ministers at Tortola to explain"—it may have "become their bounden duty to investigate" the narrative which I have adduced, regarding the present condition of these Nottinghams; but when that is done, I for one, expect that it will be taken as Mr. Frazer's was taken, in open day, and verified as his has been verified, and not only so, but that such report shall not come into those hands which garble, mutilate, conceal and suppress reports of a similar description, when these come from the West Indies. The fate of the Wesleyan Missionaries' resolutions in Jamaica, shews that the truth regarding the colonies is not always welcome in this country. In short, Sir, any report or explanation from, or regarding these people, the Nottinghams, must not be like what other reports concerning them have been, taken in secret and under the clouds of night, and transmitted in secret, either to please or deceive you and this country. The day is gone by, when full and implicit confidence can be placed on any intelligence transmitted through the usual anticolonial channels in the metropolis. I for one, have strong reasons for suspecting their good faith and their veracity, and now that we are upon this subject, and that you, as I believe, are, if not a member, certainly the champion of that Society, which sent Mr. Smith, and Mr. Elliot, to Demerara, and consequently, as I should imagine, are well acquainted with all the documents which they have received from Demerara, I think it not improper nor irrelevant to my subject, to put a question to you. You amongst others, have said that the government accounts of Mr. Smith's

From the Nottinghams *increased*, you turn to the asserted decrease of the slave population of Tortola. You hope by this set off to shield yourself from the shame and the reprobation which your Nottinghams have entailed upon you. But you are wrong. In your statements regarding the slave population of Tortola, your conduct and your proceedings are equally disingenuous and reprehensible—equally at variance with truth. You tell us, that in 1790, the slave population of Tortola was 9000, which with 1009 subsequently imported, left 10,009 to be accounted for, whilst, by the Registry of 1822, the number then remaining, was only 6478, and which allowing for manumissions (304 from 1808,) shews a decrease of 3531, in thirty-four years. But the disparity of the sexes and the number exported, you have *candidly* omitted and shut out from your account! In confirmation of your statement, you have the hardihood to refer to the papers, page 114, printed by order of the House of Commons, in March last year. These returns you have concealed or misrepresented, and to shew that you have done so, I shall transcribe them from the page of the paper you quote, (No. 89,) which now lies before me. The census of the population of Tortola, according to the tax rolls, &c. stood thus:—

		Number.	*Manumitted by deed.*	*Manumitted by will.*	*Exported.*
In.....	1812	7,269	2	4	50
.....	1813	7,089	1	4	8
1814—15—16, no returns			27	30	3
.....	1817	6,838	8	21	16
..... (by Registry,)	1818	6,899	35	30	
..... (Tax Rolls,)	1819	6,808	17	7	3
.....	1820	6,591	4		
..... (by Registry,)	1821	6,460	13	5	11
.....	1822	6,634	10	15	

trial were garbled, and that the Society, of which he was a servant, had received copies of the proceedings, his Journal included, complete, full, accurate and ungarbled. This, therefore, being the case, you, who I presume, must as the champion who wrote so much about them, have seen them, can answer the following questions:—

Is it or is it not true, that in Mr. Smith's Journal, there is a *Sunday* entry to the following purport: Mr. and Mrs. Elliot dined with us—during dinner, a family quarrel arose between them, high words succeeded between Mr. Elliot and his wife, which ended by the former knocking the latter down at the table?

The last number is taken from an accurate return for 1822, furnished me by private authority. The other numbers are from the official return—the number exported for 1822, is, however, wanting, and the number manumitted in that year, comes down only to the month of March. To the number exported by the official list, I have added 12 slaves imported into Demerara in 1812, and into Trinidad at different times nine more, all from Tortola, but which are not entered in the Tortola official list, which shews a want of accuracy on these heads.

The number of slaves then in Tortola, according to the paper to which you refer, was,

In 1812,.....		7,269
1822,.....		6,634
Deficiency,.....		635
But in that period there were		
Emancipated,.....	233	
Exported,.....	91	
Hurricane, 1819, killed, *above*.....	100	
		424
Deficiency,.....		211

But then from this number ought to be deducted the extra deaths which took place in the following year, when there was no crop made, and when much sickness and distress prevailed, on account of the want of provisions, which were totally destroyed by the hurricane. Were the fact fully known, the whole deficiency of 211, would probably be readily and satisfactorily accounted for.

You are not ignorant, Sir, of the hurricane of 1819, and the loss of lives in it, and subsequent loss by the misery which it entailed—you have omitted to notice the number exported, as set down in the page preceding the one in the parliamentary document, to which you refer, and you pass over the number of

Is it or is it not true, that the Rev. Mr. Davies wrote home to the Society, a very full account of the insurrection in Demerara, and in which he attributed, a large share of the cause of it either to "the imprudence," or "the criminality" of Mr. Smith, and that upon receiving the communication, the Society, or some one in their name, who said he was acting for them, wrote Mr. Davies, that they were perfectly astonished to receive such a communication from him, and that they did not believe a word of it? These are important questions, and they ought to be answered.

slaves (how many I know not, but it was considerable,) carried from Tortola to Trinidad and Demerara, in the years subsequent to the capture of these possessions. I know a considerable number was also carried to Grenada. You say not one syllable about all these things, though had your object been honest, you would have searched them out, known and acknowledged them. Instead of doing this, you set down the difference between the number said to be in Tortola, in 1790, and the number found in it at the end of 1821, as cut off "*by severity of treatment, excess of labour, and scantiness of food,*" (page 98.) Is this just? is this correct? is this honest? No!

At page 98, you tell us that by the Registry of 1818, there were 6815 slaves in Tortola. As printed by order of the House of Commons in the paper referred to, the number in 1821, was 6899, but you raise them, upon what authority I know not, and care not, to 6901. Let them stand so. At the close of 1822, the number was 6684, leaving a deficiency of 267, from which we have to deduct 85 manumitted and exported, (the latter incomplete) and "*above*" 100 killed during the hurricane, leaving 67 only, or *one per cent.* in four years, instead of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. as you assert, and if we had an accurate return of those exported, and who died in 1820, on account of sickness, privation and want, brought on by the hurricane, we should probably find an increase instead of a decrease.

In descending to particular estates, your ignorance or your disingenuity, is equally conspicuous. Thus on the estate of Mr. Hetherington, you tell us by the Registry of 1818, there were 458 (456 only) slaves, and in 1822—only 404 with one manumission. But you do not tell us as you ought to have told us, that Mr. Hetherington's estate, and negroes, suffered more severely than any other in the island by the hurricane. He himself lost his life, and a considerable number of his negroes certainly perished by that calamity, and more, I believe, in consequence of it. You cannot deny these facts. If you were not acquainted with them, it was your duty to have made yourself acquainted with them.

The estates (for there are five, not one) of Mrs. *Ruth Lettsome*, to which you also allude, were similarly situated. They suffered severely by that physical calamity and its fatal conse-

quences. What number of slaves was upon them, at the early period you mention, I cannot say, and I should be extremely credulous and blameable, after what I have seen, shown, and know, if I depended upon your information on that point. This, I find out, however, from a return now lying before me, furnished by a Mercantile House in this city, of unimpeachable integrity and honour, that the INCREASE on these Estates, for the year ending June 1824, was ELEVEN! the total number being 378 females, and 268 males.* A point of still greater importance, with regard to the previous history of these Estates, you have also omitted to notice, which is, that they have been disputed by heirs, and are under the management of the Court of Chancery in England, and have been so during the last *fifteen or twenty years.* During a considerable portion of that time, they were placed by the Court, under the management of a man ignorant of his business as a Planter, in consequence of which, the Estates and Negroes suffered severely, not from his "SEVERITY," but from his ignorance and indolence, by which the Estates became disorganized. Some few years ago, the mortgagees got this person removed, and a practical planter, and experienced man appointed, since which time, affairs are completely changed for the better. "Scantiness of food," or supplies, were not the cause of the decrease of the slaves, for I assert, on the authority of those who furnished these supplies, that they were even more abundantly supplied, than estates in

* *Negroes on the Lettsoms Estates, on 3d June,* 1824.

		Females.	*Males.*	*Increase during 1 Year. Females.*	*Males.*
On Cane Garden Bay Estate,	3d June, 1823	68	47		
	3d June, 1824	70	47	2	0
Mount Healthy do.	3d June, 1823	85	59		
	3d June, 1824	85	62	0	3
Turnbull's Mountain do.	3d June, 1823	72	49		
	3d June, 1824	72	49	0	0
Northside Mountain do.	3d June, 1823	85	47		
	3d June, 1824	86	49	1	2
Lower..... do.	3d June, 1823	63	60		
	3d June, 1824	65	61	2	1
		378	262	5	6
		262		6	
		635		11	
Increase from June 1823, to June 1824.....		11			
Total on 3d June, 1824.....		646			

the most prosperous condition. A moment's reflection, and looking at the disproportion of the sexes, 378 females, to 268 males, will enable any one acquainted with the Colonies, and with Africans, to trace the decrease to its true source, viz. want of proper discipline, by which the males became dissipated, diseased, and shortened their days by indulging their vices, leaving no families to replace their loss. This fact is perfectly demonstrable, from the number upon the Estates in 1818, viz. 311 males, and 399 females, which gives a decrease of 33 males, and 21 females, or one half more in the former, than in the latter. Females cannot of themselves, as you know, produce children. The number of slaves in Tortola, by the census of 1821, was 3,485 females, and 2,975 males, so that if *paired*, a decrease must take place amongst the females left without males, and to hear of a moderate decrease in Tortola, appears to me a strong proof of the virtue of the population, and that the chief men do not, like the chiefs in Africa, appropriate, as you inform us they do appropriate, all the females to themselves.

It would be throwing away time to follow you in your other references to particular estates, capable, I have no doubt, of being elucidated in the same manner as those I have noticed. Your general assertion, that the decrease, where that takes place in Tortola or elsewhere, proceeds from "*severity of treatment, excess of labour, and scantiness of food,*" deserves a moment's consideration. On the words, "*scantiness of food,*" I perceive you, as usual, retain a mental reservation—a salvo to your conscience, like the story of the "*agents,*" (not slave drivers, though it was left to mean such) in the Nottingham case. It was your business to show, that the want of food, where it was deficient proceeded from the act of man, and not from causes, "the act of God or the King's enemies!"—causes which man can neither foresee, prevent, nor control. The loss you allude to, both in Jamaica and in Tortola, in the two principal instances you adduce, you know well proceeded from the latter causes, and therefore you refrain from stating the fact. Still you think your conscience safe, by using the expression "*scantiness of food,*" without saying what occasioned it. With regard to severity of treatment, that is a charge long since exploded and refuted, and with regard to the decrease in

Tortola, proceeding from the "*excess of labour*," I shall put that to the proof, and settle the point against you in a moment. Thus, 6,634 slaves in Tortola produce 1772 hhds. of sugar, (for I shall keep to this species of cultivation alone as the criterion, though I lose some benefit in argument by doing so,) or *one fourth* of a hhd. to each. In Demerara, 77,000 slaves produce 50,000 hhds, two thirds of a hhd. to each. In St. Vincents, 22,000 slaves produce 17,000 hhds. about three fourths of a hhd. to each. In Jamaica, 340,000 slaves produce 113,000 hhds. or one third of a hhd. to each; and in all the West Indies, 720,000 slaves produce 270,000 hhds. about *two thirds* to each, so that the slaves in Tortola do less work than the slaves in any other place.

In page 97, you venture upon a subject, which I should scarcely have expected you would have touched. You tell us, that the slaves owned by free coloured persons in Tortola, had increased from 546 in 1818, to 1766 in 1822, inferring, or leaving it to be inferred, that they treat their slaves better than the WHITES. This is your drift. But you faintly tell us, that *all* this increase proceeded from "large bequests." Could not you have said, that the late George Martin left above 600 to his coloured family. But the chief point deserving notice, is your statement correct? I admit that the free coloured population who owned slaves, have increased from 81 in 1818, to 120 in 1822. Why, Sir, have not you, and your friend *Mr. Stephen* been writing and telling this country during the last ten years, that to obtain freedom in the West Indies, was all but impracticable, so much so, that any man of colour might "*be sold with his deed of manumission in his hand.*" Yet here you boast of their rapid and unobstructed increase, thus falsifying with your own hands, all your previous libels on this head.

Your statement put forward regarding the natural increase of the slaves in the United States, is totally at variance with the truth. Mr. Gladstone, in his able Letters in reply to your "*friend*" Mr. CROPPER, showed from documents which you cannot disprove, that there have been nearly 700,000 imported within the periods to which you allude! Your statement also regarding Demerara is grossly incorrect, but as you seem to put little faith in it, and to lay little stress upon it, I pass it by

without further remark, and hasten to Jamaica, which you bring forward as your heaviest piece of "*artillery*" on the occasion. The statement regarding it, which you have thought proper to produce, is as gross, and I will add as I shall show it to be, a misrepresentation, misstatement and exaggeration, as barefaced as any you ever penned. Page 99, you say:—

"In a report of the Assembly of Jamaica, dated November 12th, 1788, and laid before Parliament, it is affirmed, that between the years 1780 and 1787, 15,000 slaves actually perished from want in Jamaica alone. And if so many actually perished, STARVED TO DEATH, what must have been the sufferings of the rest! THE CAUSE ASSIGNED for this dreadful mortality and wretchedness, was THE DESTRUCTION OF THE PLANTAIN TREES BY HURRICANES!!"

The Report, Sir, to which you allude, is the Report presented along with other documents, to the Committee of the Privy Council in 1789, and printed in their voluminous Report. From Part 3d, pages 4 and 5 of the Jamaica Report, I select the whole passage referred to, and request the attention of the Reader to it, in order to ascertain how you falsify, and mutilate, and misrepresent official documents. The Committee of the Assembly of Jamaica state:—

"We shall now point out the causes to which this mortality is justly chargeable. It is but too well known to the House, that in the several years 1780, 1781, 1784, 1785, and 1786, it pleased DIVINE PROVIDENCE to visit this Island with repeated hurricanes, which spread *desolation* throughout most parts of the Island; but the Parishes which suffered more remarkably than the rest, were those of Westmoreland, Hanover, St. James, Trelawny, Portland, and St. Thomas in the East. By these destructive visitations, the *Plantain walks*, which furnish the chief article of support to the Negroes, were generally rooted up; and the INTENSE DROUGHTS WHICH FOLLOWED, destroyed those different species of *Ground Provisions* which the hurricanes had not reached. The storms of 1780 and 1781 happening during the time OF WAR, NO FOREIGN SUPPLIES, except a trifling assistance from prize vessels, *could be obtained on any terms;* and a FAMINE ensued in the Leeward parts of the Island, which destroyed *many thousand Negroes.* After the storm of

the 30th July, 1784, the Lieutenant Governor, by the advice of his Council, published a Proclamation, dated the 7th August, permitting the free importation of Provisions and Lumber in Foreign Bottoms, for four months from that period. As this was much too short a time to give sufficient notice, and obtain all the supplies that were necessary, the small quantities of Flour, Rice, and other Provisions which were imported in consequence of the Proclamation, *soon rose to so exorbitant a price*, as to induce the Assembly, on the 9th November following, to present an Address to the Lieutenant Governor, requesting him to prolong the term until the latter end of March 1785; observing, that it was impossible for the *natural productions of the Country* to come to such maturity, as to be wholesome food before that time. The term of four months not being expired when this address was presented, the Lieutenant Governor *declined to comply therewith;* but, on the 1st December following, the House represented, that the prolongation of the term was absolutely necessary. Accordingly, the Lieutenant Governor, by the advice of His Majesty's Council, directed, that the time formerly limited, should be extended to the 31st January, then next ensuing, (1785,) but at the same time, he informed the House, *that he was not at liberty to deviate any longer from the regulations which* HAD BEEN ESTABLISHED IN GREAT BRITAIN!"

"From the 31st January, 1785, therefore, the *Ports continued shut, and the sufferings of the poor* NEGROES *in consequence thereof*, for some months afterwards, WERE EXTREME. Providentially the season became more favourable about May, and considerable quantities of corn and ground provisions were gathered by the month of August, when *the Fourth storm happened*, and the Lieutenant Governor immediately shut the Ports against the exportation of any of our Provisions to the French and Spanish Islands, which were supposed to have suffered more than ourselves; but *not thinking himself at liberty to permit the importation of Provisions in American vessels*, the productions of the country were soon exhausted, and the usual attendants of scanty and unwholesome diets, dropsies and epidemic dysenteries, were again dreadfully prevalent in the Spring of the Summer

of 1786, and *proved fatal to a great number of the Negroes in all parts of the Country.*"

"On the 20th October, in that year, happened the *Fifth* dreadful hurricane, *which again laid waste the Leeward parishes,* and COMPLETED THE TRAGEDY. We decline to enlarge on the consequences which followed, *lest we may appear to exaggerate;* but, having endeavoured to compare with as much accuracy as the subject will admit, the number of our Slaves, whose destruction may be fairly attributed to these *repeated calamities,* and the UNFORTUNATE MEASURE OF INTERDICTING FOREIGN SUPPLIES, and for this purpose, compared the imports and returns of Negroes, for the last seven years, with those of seven years preceding, we hesitate not, after every allowance for adventitious causes, to fix the whole at FIFTEEN THOUSAND. This number we firmly believe to have perished of *Famine,* or *of diseases contracted by scanty and unwholesome diet,* between the latter end of 1780, and the beginning of 1787."

Look, Sir, at this ungarbled narrative, and which cannot be contradicted in one single point, and if you have the smallest spark of candour remaining in your bosom, say, how different it is, from that which you pretend to adduce from the same pages, and from the same authority. Instead of the loss being occasioned by "*the destruction*" of "*the Plantain trees*" alone, as you leave it to be believed, the loss was occasioned by annual calamities of the kind, by "*intense droughts,*" and the destruction of *every species* of ground provisions," by the American war, and above all, by the misery and want created by the jealous and peremptory Commercial regulations of the Mother Country—in short, by a train of misfortunes which deserve to be considered with compassion, not reproach. By the above causes, the loss was occasioned, and not as you assert "*starved to death*" in the midst of that plenty which the masters had to give; but which, unfeeling interest would not let them bestow. Such, if words have a meaning, your words "*starved to death*" must mean. The Public, Sir, will appreciate from this exposure, the safety with which it can rely upon statements brought forward, and public occurrences and misfortunes so dreadfully perverted by you.

In these calamities Jamaica stood not isolated. Barbadoes with less than one fourth of the population of the former, sustained a loss of about 15,000 slaves in 1786, from similar causes. But this, you also pass over and suppress, probably, because by last Registry returns you find, that in the Slave population of Barbadoes, there is an increase of 1000, independent of the exportation and manumissions in the interim, taking place. But the best refutation of your charge of cruelty, and bad treatment of their slaves, which you bring against the Whites in Jamaica, is found in the following unbiassed and candid testimony of the *Rev. R. Young*, a Wesleyan Missionary, some time resident in that Colony, and well acquainted with the facts of the case. In a Sermon delivered to his congregation, 1824, and as it has been printed by him, he says, addressing himself to the slaves in Jamaica—"It ought also to be remembered, that the situation of life, in which Providence has placed you, is not without its comforts; for, when you have performed your appointed work, you are happily delivered from all anxiety and tormenting care, and in the evening of each day, can return to your humble cabins with confidence, being assured that no *Creditor*, will be found there, CLAIMING THE LITTLE PROPERTY of which you may be possessed: * *no sick wife or sick child* will be there, *without* the aid of medicine, and, if required, the assistance of a *nurse;*

* To ascertain the nature and extent of what slaves are not subjected to on this head, I adduce as a faint proof, the following statement read the other day, (Jan. 14th,) at a meeting of the Glasgow Society established for the relief of small debtors, the Lord Provost in the chair:—

"Mr. Davie read the report, which stated in substance, that on the 1st of December, 1823, when the Committee entered on the business of their office as visitors, there were 63 persons under confinement for debt; and that during the year, from that date inclusive to 1st December, 1824, there were upwards of 900 commitments. Of these cases the Committee were called upon to investigate upwards of 160; in which there were 133 male debtors, and 30 female: and of these, six were for debts of 5s. and under; 12 from 5s. to 10s.; 19 from 10s. to 15s.; 18 from 15s. to 20s.; 26 from 20s. to 30s.; 16 from 30s. to 40s.; 21 from 40s. to £3; 27 from £3 to £5; being in all, 145 under £5; 5 from £5 to £10; and three from £10 and not exceeding £30, exclusive of expenses. Upwards of 90 were liberated by their creditors, on the Committee's application, in consequence of arrangements made for payment of the debts by instalments, such as the debtors were likely to be able to afford; and upwards of 20 were liberated

neither will your children meet you at your doors *with looks expressive of starvation*, and pierce your hearts with cries of hunger.—No! *Such scenes of misery are not found in your dwellings*, for your 'bread is given you, and your waters are sure.' —Such, however, are the trials of *many of the labouring poor in England*, as can be abundantly testified; and I feel no reluctance in stating, that many of them *have much harder labour*, and ENJOY FEWER COMFORTS, than the generality of slaves in Jamaica."

Although I do not imagine as you seem to do, that two Blacks will make a White, still I cannot help for a moment reverting to your ebullition against the Jamaica Proprietors, for not setting their slaves to work, to cultivate (as if they did not) ground provisions, exclusively, to have removed the effects of the calamities heaped upon them by events beyond their control. Pray, Sir, as an East Indian Proprietor, I will ask, why you do not put your East Indian servants, and *slaves* to work, to cultivate Rice and Wheat, and Indian Corn, instead of Sugar, that by so doing, they may become independent of those frequent famines, which depopulate and scourge Provinces in that quarter; and I would further ask of you, how you and your despotic fellow sovereigns would take it, were such scourges and their consequences to be

in consequence of proceedings under the Act of Grace, and the expense of which was either wholly or partially defrayed from the funds of the Society. Many of the cases were attended with peculiar circumstances of distress, such as to call for the Society's interference. About 100 of the persons whose cases the Committee investigated had families; in one of which there were eight children; in two, six; in fourteen, five; in seven, four; and in seventy-five, from one to three. Almost the whole of the debtors were operatives and labourers. Three were nearly blind. Two were sixty years of age, one of whom was for a debt of 10s.; one sixty-five, one sixty-seven, and one seventy years of age; and this last for a debt of £1: 10s. One was a young woman in bad health, for a debt of 4s.; one a widow with five children, for a debt of 8s. 10d.; and one, a coal porter, with a wife and five children, for a debt of 3s. 3d.—In the case of a poor weaver, for a debt of £2: 3s. 2d. the creditor expended £4 of aliment, and detained him in jail for three months; and in the case of a labourer, with a wife and three children, for a debt of 4s., the creditor lodged 21s. for aliment, and detained him a prisoner for six weeks. The expenditure of the Society amounted to the inconsiderable sum of £5: 17s. 9d., being about 8¾d. for each case investigated, and about 1s. 1d. for each case in which the debtor's liberation was effected."—From such miseries slaves are free.

charged to, and, as resulting from "severity of treatment, excess of labour, and scantiness of food!"

Amidst your "heat and your strength of prejudice," you look only to one side of a question, and to that side for the express purpose of making out a case against the other side, that you may blacken it with your African Brush. Granting that all your statements about the decrease of slaves in the West India Colonies are correct, as they are not, still, it is not difficult to match, aye, more than to match them with similar contrasts, from places governed as you please to direct. First, we have the *Winkel* artisan negroes in Berbice, decreasing at the rate of ten per cent. in ten years. Next, "*Par fas et nefas*," you have during the last sixteen years carried into Sierra Leone above 30,000 Negroes, yet you cannot now produce us above eleven or twelve thousand of these! Under your sway, the Nova Scotian Blacks have dwindled down in thirty years, from nearly 1500 to 722. In the space of 18 months, the Disbanded African Soldiers decreased from 1223 to 1110, and in the same space of time, the Liberated Africans, notwithstanding the addition of nearly 1600 to their ranks, decreased from 8,076 to 7,969, being at the rate of nearly 20 per cent. In your own words, I may ask you, "Could this have been the case, had they given them the brief time, necessary to provide for their own subsistence? What have been the proximate causes of all this *frightful accumulation of misery and death.* Without all question, these have been severity of treatment, and scantiness of food. Let us consider this unexampled *waste* of human life. Will the Parliament and the people of Great Britain, suffer this system to continue? IT IS QUITE IMPOSSIBLE. They will demand that the *nuisance* should be forthwith removed." Yes, Sir, most unquestionably, and at an early day, this nation, deluded and deceived, will demand at your hand an account of the thousands "*of God's creatures*" sacrificed in that pestilential swamp, and also an account of the millions of money squandered away in blowing up the bubble of scheming, dreaming, "*wrong-headed*" philanthropy, and commercial speculation.

As the climate is the same, the cause and effect cannot in physical matters be different in Jamaica and in Sierra Leone.

The governing power may differ in name, but still the results be similar. But hostile as I am to Sierra Leone as a settlement, and solely from the position of the place in Africa, and from the childish mode of proceeding there adopted, to civilize and enlighten Africa, still I will as little do it the injustice, as I will do the West Indies the injustice, to set down the decrease of the black population in either, as the effects "of severity, oppression, and want of food." The cause, I believe, which occasions the decrease in both, is the same in every country, as it has been the same in every age. In settling and controlling the savage or fierce barbarian, under the sway of civilized life and manners, under whatever name the power which is to effect it is applied, the change will produce, for a considerable time, a decrease of the species. To them every yoke is slavery. Deprived of his *natural* liberty, the savage and barbarian sink into a state of torpor, indolence and decay, and generations elapse before their progeny, at first but feeble and few, become initiated into the manners of civilized life, get accustomed or inured to its labours and its industry, and become invigorated with that life and activity, which knowledge and civilization bestow. Even amongst the irrational tribes, the same phenomena are seen. To bring them from a wild to a tame state, the waste of life is great, even amongst those species of animals with which it is most practicable and most practised. But if you will not allow this to be the cause of the decrease of the barbarous Africans in the West Indies, so neither can you expect that I will allow it to be the cause of their decrease in Sierra Leone. The point under such circumstances would remain as before, when, if cruelty and oppression are the causes of the decrease of the West India population, the still *more rapid decrease* of the population of Sierra Leone, must be set down to the same cause.

Smarting under the lash of your African disappointments and blasted civilizing schemes—conscious that all the deceptions and pompous descriptions, in these things which, you more than others have proclaimed in, and imposed upon this country, will speedily be exposed to the ridicule of the British empire, you want to turn aside the shame of defeat, and the disgrace and reproach attendant thereon, by harassing and

torturing our Colonies, that you may involve them also in your African fall. It was to have been supposed that all Africa, as a field of experiment, would have satisfied your ambition. Engaged therein, you were bound to complete, certainly to advance in the undertaking, before you commenced your operations in any other quarter. But this you have not done. Rest assured that India may be benefited and Africa improved, without destroying our West India Colonies. Their total ruin will not advance you one inch in your African path.

Look at the progress of your schemes and advice in Africa, as contrasted with those of others, and from these, see your ignorance, and your errors, and profit by doing so. You have laboured thirty-seven years in Africa, spent millions of the national funds in a climate, as you state, congenial to the cultivation of the Cotton plant, and yet you have abandoned, or, have been compelled to abandon, the trifling Cotton cultivation which you had begun. But see what others—men too whom you would designate barbarians can do and have done in Africa. I hold in my hand a letter to a merchant here, dated *Alexandria*, Egypt, October 21st, 1824, wherein the writer states, that the Cotton crop of Egypt last year, would amount to 300,000 bales, besides a prodigious and increasing quantity of Indigo, Opium, &c. The Cotton produce has been raised to this vast amount in the short space of *three years*, under the direction of the present Pacha. Look at this, Sir, and say what you have to answer for, both to this Country, and to India, for your childish proceedings in Africa, and Sierra Leone. No reasonable being can doubt that if Great Britain had had a man with the judgment, decision, and activity of the Egyptian Pacha, Mohammed Ali, as Governor of Sierra Leone, in place of your "friends and admirers," and only half the funds at his disposal, which you have had at yours, that by this time, a settlement on the Coast of Africa properly chosen, would have been made as productive as Egypt, and that the British banners would by this day, have been waving in triumph over the banks of the Niger.

The mode in which a portion of the trade of Sierra Leone is NOW carried on, seems evidently intended to hoodwink this

country. The import of coffee into Great Britain in 1823, only "ONE BARREL," which I dragged to light, and you could not deny, seems to have awakened the Sierra Leone sophists to the danger of exposure. Accordingly we find by our import lists for last year, a *barrel* and a *bag* now and then dropping in. Curiosity led me to look into these lists, and the following is the result of my research into "*Meyer's Liverpool Advertiser*," and "*Prince's London Price Current*," for 1824:—

COFFEE Imported into London in 1824, from Sierra Leone—SIX CASKS, AND ONE BAG!"

COFFEE Imported into Liverpool from Sierra Leone, in 1824, TWENTY-NINE BAGS!

COFFEE exported from Liverpool to Sierra Leone in 1824, FIFTY CWT. at one exportation!

COFFEE exported from London to Sierra Leone in 1824—22,575 lbs. one entry, on March, 5th, is 20,899 lbs. FOREIGN! exclusive of the Coffee exported to St. Mary's, (about 1200 lbs.) and that to Cape Coast!

It is obvious from these returns, that the coffee importing from Sierra Leone, is coffee previously exported from this country to that place, while it is equally evident that the exports of coffee to Sierra Leone are more than double the imports. Nor is this all worth observing. The export of 20,000 lbs. of FOREIGN COFFEE (not East India) previously imported, either from Brazils or the foreign West Indies, or probably from some other part of the African coast,* though produced by slaves, is accounted a *fair and profitable* mercantile adventure to that FREE AND INDUSTRIOUS settlement!

Another proof of the industry and sobriety of the place is found in the fact, that there are in *Freetown*, more and better employed spirit shops, than in any other place of its size in any other country; and of the quantity of spirits consumed there, the reader shall judge when I state, that by the mercantile registers already referred to, the exports of rum, brandy, and geneva, from Liverpool and London last year to *Sierra Leone*, exceeded 90,000 gallons! In this manner you civilize our African brethren! In this manner you enlighten and tame savages! Idleness, and abundance of ardent spirits!

* The imports from other parts of Africa into Liverpool, last year, were 68 bags, 57 casks, 6 puns. 2 tierces, and one barrel.

Cease, therefore, to mislead and impose upon this nation, and to plague the government thereof further—Cease to injure, malign, and defame our Colonial possessions, and abandon the regulation of the affairs of Africa and of this empire, to more experienced hands than yours—to the official servants of our Sovereign.

An East India Proprietor, you surely cannot for a moment suppose that the population of this country are so stultified, as not to believe, that interest may *bias* your mind, amidst all your professions of philanthropy. You tell us, without disguise, that the introduction of East India Sugar would ruin our Western Colonies, advance the interests of India, and consequently benefit your interests also. And yet you would have this nation credit all your exertions to the score of humanity. You know very well, that it was *some* East India Proprietors and American speculators, who first set the present anticolonial mania in motion. These mingled in Parliament, with those who are commonly named *Saints*, and they courted these *Saints* to associate with them, while both parties, coalesced under the banners of free trade, and the rights of man, and "THE CAUSE OF GOD," in order to carry their point, which is to advance East India Stock by the cry of philanthropy and religion. Under the banners of misrepresentation, the trading anticolonists, of which you are one, were set to blow the trumpet of liberty and humanity, and rouse the population, including every where, old women and old maids, to overawe the Government, and "drive" the nation, by an act of *felo de se*, to fill your Oriental pockets, at the expense of us all. You know the results—the alarms—the mischief. But you overshot your mark. Your violence opened the eyes of the reasoning and the disinterested, still the strength and support of this country, and they now see through your designs. They now appreciate the motives, and boast as you will, you never can again call forth the same rash and unthinking spirit of violence, which you did in the beginning of last year.

In vain you quibble about "*the particular species of slavery* existing in our Colonies—the *worst* species of slavery which has ever afflicted humanity," (page 76) as a shield to protect you in your dilemma; as the scape-goat to bear away your

temerity, in marking down slavery as a state "*directly at variance with the will* OF THE SUPREME GOVERNOR OF THE UNIVERSE," *(Preface*, p. 22, *Buxton's Debate.)* You are driven from that strong hold in which you attempted to intrench yourself, and from which your party hoped to fulminate their decrees and resolutions, to proclaim as a religious, imperative duty, the annihilation of all the property held under the laws of their country, by your fellow subjects in the West Indies. From that high and commanding ground, you are forced to descend and to talk more rationally and reasonably—more like a Christian. You are compelled, though you seem to retain some mental reservation in acknowledging it, to put the subject on its proper ground, namely, as a political question, and a question of civil rights and national justice. There, Sir, you can be met by the laws of your country, and of every civilized state, and then and there, your declamation and misrepresentions, *sink* to their proper level. Though the building be old, and though it stands in a threatening attitude, and though it be not so beautiful as the finer architecture of other parts of the fabric of the Empire, still all you can do by the laws of your country, is to compel the proprietors to take the building down, and erect a similar superstructure, in a more substantial manner; but you cannot compel them to erect it on a plan that may deteriorate the value of their property, nor can you deprive them of it, or of the ground on which it stands, in order to erect a building of a different kind, such as you plan out, without a positive law made to that purpose, and after full and ample compensation and indemnification. It is idle declamation to talk about human beings being property. Your country and your laws *made them such*, and when she thinks proper for her benefit, or for her sin-offering, to render them no longer property, she must pay their value, at the rate it bore, when considered a secure and protected *fee simple*. Any thing else, Sir, is injustice and confiscation. It is a miserable subterfuge to veil your real views, by asserting that the slavery in our West India Colonies, is more odious and oppressive than slavery elsewhere, in ancient or in modern times. It is not so; in many respects it is considerably more ameliorated than any other, either in ancient times, or that which exists at present

in almost every other quarter of this globe, more especially that which exists in *your* Oriental dominions, and those other Eastern Countries which you recommend to our connexion, and confidence, and regard.

I have given in the preceding pages and sheets, a few precious specimens of the accuracy and candour of that "VERACIOUS" Gentleman, *Anglus*, and have shewed to this country how little he is to be trusted in any thing he advances on Colonial affairs. Such is the fatal bias which your mind has received, from pursuing so long, a particular object, by crooked policy, (though you may not see it in this light) under the belief, it would appear, that the end justifies the means, that every thing is catched hold off, that can be supposed to strengthen your cause, however much it may afterwards turn out to be at variance with the fact. I do not mean to say, or even to insinuate, that you would deliberately state what you know to be untrue. Far from it. But your anxiety to press all things into your service, without knowing exactly the object which you have in view, or the *right* way to gain it, or the consequences likely to result from it, that you are from necessity, frequently involved in the grossest contradictions, and appear, without any intention I am sure, on your part, or even being conscious of doing so, to be stating what is obviously at variance with truth. In following out your object in this way, you are necessarily compelled to labour in disguise and under a cloud, and consequently, are led to unsay to-day what you said yesterday, and contradict to-morrow the solemn intentions you entertained, and the promises you made to-day. This necessarily destroys all confidence in your protestations and promises, and tends to make your opponents, and those whom you assail, deeply and keenly suspicious of all your objects, projects, and actions, as well as the objects, projects, and actions of the party with which you act, and of which you may be considered as the working, and the most efficient member. I will adduce you a striking example in proof. In his *Second* Letter (page 25—29, 1816,) to Mr. Wilberforce, regarding the Registry Bill, Mr. Stephen says:—

"If a general Registry of slaves be obtained, (not such as the interior Legislatures will, or can establish, but such as your

Bill proposes to provide, a Registry which shall really prove effectual to its object,) THEN WE ARE CONTENT THAT THE REFORMING OF SLAVERY BY ACT OF PARLIAMENT SHALL END. Though I have no authority to speak for the friends of our cause at large, I doubt not that such is the common opinion, and would be the willing engagement of those who act with us in promoting the Registration of slaves. Let these and the other securities proposed by your bill, be given against the fraudulent evasion of the *Abolition Acts;* and we are willing to abide the experiment." But "denied a fair trial of the experiment we prefer, we shall be driven to others, in which we have less confidence indeed, but which it would be opprobrious, in that case, to leave untried." Amongst other things, he added, "it will be our bounden duty to call on the Legislature to prohibit, at least, the brutal practice of driving, and other destructive oppressions, in the exercise of the master's power. With all the difficulties of giving effect to such laws on Plantations, it is a work which it would be criminal not to attempt, IF A REGISTRY, in other words, an effectual Abolition, *the best remedy* for such evils, be withheld."

A Registry was obtained, on principles which you have never dared to arraign. "*The driving system,*" as you designate it, now put in the front of the battle, was here abandoned without regret or compunction. You are also now compelled to acknowledge, that evasions of the Abolition Acts are wholly unknown. Here then, by the most solemn, voluntary, and public declaration, "the reforming of slavery by act of Parliament," was to "end!" Have you stuck to the declaration? No! Fresh laws are demanded, fresh unconstitutional interferences, in short, the total overthrow of our Colonial system, and the destruction of all property vested under it. Reforming slavery by British acts of Parliament, is not more dangerous than impracticable. Let us attend to what the Edinburgh Review says on the subject, when it spoke the language of wise and steady Statesmen. "If mitigations have been favourable to the masters, still more advantageous must they be to the slave. And can any improvement bear more directly upon the condition of the lower orders, particularly upon their civilization, than an augmentation of their wealth, and *of their importance* to the superior classes? *The less that laws interfere* in

this delicate matter, so much the better for the master, *and still more for the slave.* The mutual interests of the parties, will be the *best* of laws; the *most just* of enactments, *the most unerring* in its operation, and indeed, *the only one capable of being accurately exercised,*" (vol. 6th, p. 348.) Every rational being must subscribe to these sentiments, and every honest statesman will square his conduct by the rule here laid down.

I am one of those, Sir, who believe that the slavery at present existing in our Colonies, is greatly, very greatly meliorated, that it is daily meliorating, that it will daily be meliorated, till by the extension of that knowledge and those improvements which *Capital, Credit, Civilization, and* CHRISTIAN MASTERS can bestow and carry into effect, it will in the end entirely die away without any violent convulsions, without any violent loss to the State or to individuals. In short, I believe that with the means I have alluded to, time and British masters will do the work, and moreover, that the extinction of slavery will in this way, not only be accomplished with greater safety to all parties concerned, but also that it will in this way be terminated *sooner,* than by any other way you can propose, short of bloody Revolution, or a direct and immediate Legislative Act, without any regard to municipal rights, or the principles of justice. And I believe also, Sir, that *more than one generation* must elapse before such an event can take place, except by one of the two dreadful alternatives last mentioned.

In page 102 you inform us, that your present inveterate and inconsiderate anticolonial array will prosecute your schemes and your object, "*from year to year, nay, from month to month,*" till "every slave in His Majesty's Colonies, (aye, Colonies! India is not a Colony. Cunning fox! maintain slavery there by all means!) *shall be free,* but every free man residing in them, (what are you to do with the women?) *whatever be his colour,* shall be admitted to a *participation* in those CIVIL RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES, which are enjoyed by the WHITE CLASS of His Majesty's subjects."

They must be dull indeed, who do not comprehend the full import of your present declaration. You may consider the sentiments and the principles thus brought forward very fine, but, Sir, the person who could commit them to writing, is in

truth fitter for a *strait waistcoat*, than to become a national counsellor, or an adviser of national counsellors. Every rank and office but the CROWN, are "the civil rights and privileges of the White Class of His Majesty's subjects," and you "*are wofully mistaken*," and live in an "*utter delusion*," if you can for one moment suppose, notwithstanding "*the signs of the times*," that any one of us, or even of our children's children will live to see that day, when emancipated African Blacks, will be admitted "to a participation in those civil rights and privileges which are enjoyed by the *White Class* of His Majesty's SUBJECTS." Could such a fatal moment arrive, we should then see, *exclusive of Sierra Leone, Ten* Black Peers from the West Indies, (Dukes Lemonade, Marmalade, and the Marquis of *Pepperpot*, &c. &c.) in the UPPER HOUSE. Thirty Black Members of Parliament, elected by "*the Peasantry of the Antilles*," in the LOWER HOUSE, squatting down on the floor behind the table. When this is seen, there are a few jolly members on your side who may look sharp lest they take a front bench near a Black Member of that nation from whence came that Black man who wanted to EAT the White Jurors, who were enclosed in the Jury box, to try him, at Sierra Leone! Amongst other remarkable phenomena that would be seen in that age, *might* be a Black, Lord Provost of Glasgow—of Edinburgh; and a Black, Lord Mayor of London; a Black, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs; a Black, Speaker of the House of Commons; a Black, Admiral of the Fleet; a Black, Commander-in-chief of the Army; a Black, Archbishop of Canterbury; and a woolly-headed, thicklipped, Black Cannibal, Lord Chancellor! Such we not only may have, but ought to have under the privileges you contemplate, and such we would have, because, when Africans are placed upon an equal footing with "the WHITE CLASS of His Majesty's subjects," it is quite obvious that the intellect of this nation must be *reduced* to the level of theirs; and that Great Britain may never see such days, and such *Black*, hideous degradation, is the earnest wish of,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

JAMES MACQUEEN.

Glasgow, 4th February, 1825.

aab

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
REFERENCE DEPARTMENT

This book is under no circumstances to be taken from the Building